The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 18, 1921 No. 2915

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 701
EDITORIALS:
Panama Tolls and American Honor 704
The Railroad Problem Again 705
No War With England. V. Oil 706
Haiti Speaks 708
The Courage of Your Conventions 708
THE COLLAPSE OF THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE. By Felix Morley 709
IN THE COURT OF PRESS-MADE OPINION. By Walter Nelles 711
TURGENEV AND HIS HEROES. By Jacob Zeitlin 712
AMERICAN EMIGRES. By Lily Winner 714
"THE CASE FOR THE MINERS." By Siegfried Sassoon 715
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 715
CORRESPONDENCE 716
BOOKS:
Clio: Maid of All Work. By Preserved Smith 717
The Seven Stories 717
Notable New Books 718
DRAMA:
Revivals. By Ludwig Lewisohn 719
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
The Russian-Polish Treaty 720

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor

Associate Editors

LEWIS S. GANNETT FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN

ERNEST H. GRUENING, Managing Editor
CARL VAN DOREN, Literary Editor

Contributing Editors

JOHN A. HOBSON H. L. MENCKEN
FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER ROBERT HERRICK

Subscription Rates—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

LET it be said at once that the final demand made upon the Germans by the Allies was a very marked improvement upon anything that the Allies have hitherto offered. Not only are the initial payments much smaller, but the proposed bond issues will make the burden much easier to bear and the 26 per cent tax upon the total *amount* of her exports is far better than the 12½ per cent tax originally asked on the actual exports. The sum now demanded totals 33 billion dollars. There is to be an issue of three billion dollars of 5 per cent bonds bearing date of May 1 and another of nine and one-half billions as of November 1. The remainder of the indemnity is to be covered by bonds to be issued later. Germany is to pay to the Reparations Commission $500,000,000 as an annual instalment of interest plus 26 per cent of the value of her exports, of which 26 one per cent will go toward a sinking fund. The issuance of further bonds will depend upon the results; if Germany recovers rapidly enough to bear this burden and more besides, then additional bonds will be issued. We agree with Mr. J. M. Keynes that "the decision of the Reparations Commission that Germany's total liability under the treaty amounts to 137 billion gold marks, inclusive of the sum due before May 1 and inclusive also of Germany's liability for the Belgian debt to the Allies, is a signal triumph for the spirit of justice. . . ." We are the more ready to acknowledge it because we have been such severe critics of the figures hitherto demanded. At the same time this has nothing whatever to do with Germany's power to pay. That time alone will show. We merely wish to record our belief that the terms are far better than any lately offered and that Mr. Lloyd George's speech communicating them to Parliament was of a better tone and temper than his recent utterances.

IT is no happy choice which confronts the Germans. If they sign and if it appears, as Mr. Keynes believes, that the terms, although much improved, are still impossible of fulfilment, they will be promptly charged with being liars and tricksters, whose word is not as good as a dicer's oath. More than that, so bent are the French on possessing the Ruhr that every single failure to live up to an obligation will be a fresh excuse for invasion, no matter how zealously the Germans may be seeking to execute their other obligations. The alternative to accepting the Allied terms is the surrender of the Ruhr to the French with very little likelihood of their ever getting out unless forced to by dire events at home, or by a vigorous labor ministry in England. That seizure would bring with it every single one of the evils which are the inevitable result of military occupation, widespread immorality, and disease, hatred, bitterness, and a never-ending planning for revenge by the Germans. Moreover, the huge French garrisons would deprive France of a man-power sorely needed at home. Politically, of course, the occupation of the Ruhr would be a grave blow to the new German democracy and to the new republic, besides being an economic disaster. If the French carry it out, all Europe will pay bitterly for it. But the Germans will doubtless sign.

THE Nation has right along felt that the United States must retake its place in the economic councils of Europe. Hence, on principle it heartily approves the President's, or we presume Mr. Hughes's, decision that the United States shall reenter the Supreme Council officially, the Conference of Ambassadors as an observer, and the Reparations Commission unofficially. So bound up is all the world in the economic fortunes of Europe and so blessed in means and resources is our country that there cannot possibly be a general salvaging unless the United States does its share. But everything depends upon the way in which we conduct ourselves in these various situations. The President gives his pledge that we shall not have anything to do with purely European affairs, but Mr. Harding is the greatest maker of pledges he does not live up to we have on hand just now—as witness his pledge to make a separate peace with Germany as soon as he was seated, and his Omaha promise to get the troops out of Germany just as soon as the power to do so was his. If this "sitting in" the Allied game leads us into deep entanglements, makes us a party to the wickednesses of the Treaty of Versailles, renders us as subservient a tool as Lloyd George to the imperialistic and militaristic designs of France, or leads up to our entering the present League of Nations, the resumption of our place in the counsels of the Allies will be a disaster to ourselves, to the Allies, and to all humanity. But the opportunity for enlightened leadership, for financial counsel and aid, and for playing the Good Samaritan generally, is glorious.

THERE is something extremely suspicious about the date of the Polish invasion of Upper Silesia. It occurred on May 2, at the very time the French confidently believed that they would be marching into the Ruhr. Lloyd George and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Hughes's interference prevented that, and apparently there was not time to get proper instructions through to Korfanty, so he carried out his share of the plan. It is idle to pretend that the Allies were taken by surprise by this move. The German papers have been full of prophecies of it, and of detailed accounts of Polish preparations. It is a long time since the Polish Government did anything without the Allies knowing about it. Of course, the Allies claim that they knew nothing about Korfanty's plans, and neither did the Italians about D'Annunzio's at Fiume, but we venture to risk a hat upon Poland's gratefully accepting all of Upper Silesia if Korfanty should conquer it for them. The Allied garrisons in Upper Silesia were curiously weak; even more striking is the fact that as soon as the raid occurred the French press blamed it upon the Berlin newspapers for printing misleading accounts of what the Allies would do about the plebiscite. Finally, it is to be noted that the French have promptly refused to allow German troops to enter Upper Silesia, and the press despatches state that the French troops in Poland will not fire on the Poles. For the Germans it is once more a case of "heads I win; tails you lose." For the Allies and the League of Nations it is a great test of efficiency and sincerity. If Germany loses Upper Silesia and the Ruhr she is sufficiently wrecked to satisfy the most Catonian of French imperialists. But what hypocrites it makes of the Allies and what hypocrisy is the recent plebiscite so solemnly held to let self-determination settle the fate of Silesia! At this writing the seeds of another war are perhaps being sown under our very eyes.

LET no one question Mr. Hoover's fitness for the Harding Cabinet. His recent pronouncement upon the necessity of a high tariff clearly establishes that fact if it also proves that he is sadly lacking in economic wisdom, not to say common sense, in tariff matters. "I am thoroughly imbued with the idea that we must have protection on a large scale," he told the House Ways and Means Committee. Germany, it appears, is the enemy again, or, should we say, yet? It appears that she is subsidizing production to the extent of sixty billions of paper marks (!) with the result that she is already putting our optical glass industry out of business. "It is," the Secretary assures us, "a financial process that can't go on unless all economic laws are abandoned, but at present, for instance, they are able to put their steel on the market at a price no other Government can meet." Does Mr. Hoover propose to await the inevitable disaster from such a crazy business? Does he plan to watch the result of the heavy taxes the Allies are putting on German exports which will surely offset a lot of subsidizing? Not a bit of it. On the contrary, he urges us to do the same foolish thing—subsidize our private businesses by a tariff-wall, just as if tariffs were not now a tremendous stumbling-block to economic recovery throughout Europe. As the New York *Globe* remarks one has to "think hard on his [Hoover's] good proposal for gathering commercial statistics in order to retain a friendly feeling for him"—and we shall add, for his intellectual processes.

TWO chief subjects of disagreement led to the marine strike on American-owned shipping in the coasting and cross-ocean trade. The United States Shipping Board and the American Steamship Owners' Association proposed a 25 per cent cut in pay and the open shop, later modifying the reduction in pay to 15 per cent. The steamship owners are undoubtedly in a difficult position. The Shipping Board has failed to follow the example of Great Britain in writing off part of the huge cost of war-built shipping as a war expense. Naturally it cannot operate this overcapitalized shipping at a profit in the face of a big slump in cargoes and carrying rates. The seamen are not responsible for this situation, but at the same time ought to examine open-mindedly any plan for reducing costs, since 30,000 to 40,000 of them have been out of jobs since the first of the year, owing to idle vessels. The men offered to submit the question of wages to arbitration, but the Shipping Board and the other owners refused the suggestion, thereby weakening their case with the public. The unions have also won sympathy with the public by reason of the fact that there has been almost no violence on their part. At this writing the vessel owners appear ready virtually to concede the union shop to the men, but there is a deadlock on wages.

REDUCING high wages to conform to a lower cost of living is a hard thing even for an honest man to do fairly, while in the hands of the disingenuous it can invariably be turned against the workers. The first question at issue is when the last wage increase was granted and what it was. The figures of the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics show that although there was some decrease in the cost of living between June, 1920, and the first of this year, such decrease was just about enough to offset the increase during the first six months of 1920. Thus living costs in January of this year had barely got back to those of January, 1920, if that. Since then there are no comprehensive figures. It may be said, therefore, that no wage increase granted more than a year ago can fairly be taken away because of any great fall in the cost of living. Moreover, most wage increases have lagged far behind the cost of living, and there is the further fundamental difficulty of determining what increases have been bona fide compensations for higher living costs and what have been advances in hitherto inadequate standards of living, won by workers when their labor was in demand. Violative of all these considerations is the 20 per cent cut in the wages of day workers of the United States Steel Corporation. The last wage increase was on February 1, 1920, and then only 10 per cent. The company's statement says that there were nine increases from 1915 to 1920, aggregating 150 per cent; but this was on a base of the pathetically inadequate wage of $2 for a ten-hour day in 1915!

WHEN the Senate rejected, by a vote of 60 to 15, the amendment to the Immigration Bill introduced by Senator Hiram Johnson to admit the victims of political or religious persecution abroad, a fundamental American tradition was scrapped. Our country was conceived in political and religious liberty, and grew great through the accession of men whose independence and idealism made them rebels against autocracy and oppression in other lands. America beckoned to them as the land of freedom. This it ceased to be during the late war to "make the world a better place to live in," and the Senate is merely reading the formal obsequies over a shriveled corpse. It only remains now to dismantle Bartholdi's statue in New York harbor, or at least to substitute a large illuminated *Verboten* sign for the torch. America is no longer a haven of refuge for the oppressed. It is enough to make the Founders turn in their graves.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICANS all! We cull the following names from the so-called "slacker lists" being enthusiastically published by some of the newspapers: Benevento, Dehmke, De Rose, Forbes, Jimenez, Hadasin, Kerasiotos, San Lee, Lukesiewicz, O'Connor, Turnasawa, Wisniewsky. Needless to say, a large proportion of those listed turns out to have fought, to have been decorated for bravery, and to have lost their lives in the service. The publication of an adequate "slacker list" is quite an impossible task. Many slackers after fighting valiantly—against being conscripted—yielded to the inevitable and may be discovered today among the most violent hundred percenters of the American Legion. Still others gracefully entered our various non-combatant services. Of course the slackers who ran away are entitled to no sympathy, and the publication of their names is neither undue punishment nor persecution. Had they not been cowards, or had they opposed war as a matter of principle, they would have faced the music as did the conscientious objectors, who are quite wrongly classed by the average patrioteer as slackers. But this whole belated business is both silly and futile. Some of the biggest slackers are now slacker chasers.

FOUR large religious organizations, the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, the National Catholic Welfare Council, the Central Conference of American Rabbis, and the United Synagogue of America—Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—have united in issuing an appeal for an international conference looking to disarmament. They have sent 100,000 letters to clergymen, urging them to appeal to their congregations to send letters to Congress and to President Harding. More than that there will be a congress of all the religious agencies in the United States in Chicago from May 17 to May 19 to work out a complete plan for the international disarmament congress at that time. But President Harding remains obdurate. He does not believe that the way to disarm is to disarm; that there never could be a better time to disarm than the present. For him the way to international "normalcy" remains the way of stupidity. He puts off even the discussion of a reduction in armaments until after the treaty of peace with Germany is signed—as if a completely disarmed Germany had anything to do with the disarmament of the rest of the world. His own Secretary of the Treasury tells us that if we do not disarm we face bankruptcy. His common sense ought to tell him that disarmament will do more to bring about political stability in Europe than anything else.

IS it not a combination in restraint of trade that the Protestant ministers of Worcester have covenanted together to refuse to marry any couple already turned away from the altar on "moral grounds," or to remarry "the guilty party in divorce proceedings," or to marry any persons at all whom the Protestant ministers of Worcester consider unfit for the "sacred responsibilities" of the conjugal order? Here we have the censor again. Here we have another little vested interest interpreting the law according to its own bias. Here we have once more a serious Mrs. Partington brandishing a broom in the face of the tide. How large and loose are the words about refusing "marriage in all cases to those whom we deem unfit for its sacred responsibilities"! The only comfort is that the words mean nothing and presumably will do no particular harm. What is the ministers' poison will merely turn out to be meat for the magistrates.

NEWS has recently been received of the death in Upper Burma, on the frontier of Tibet and China, of one of the boldest and ablest of scientific English explorers. Mr. Reginald Farrer, scion of an old Yorkshire family and a distinguished Oxford University graduate, spent the years 1915 and 1916 in a long journey through Northwestern China, traversing regions which were almost unknown to Europeans, and which no European traveler seems to have ever described. They were wild and mountainous regions, lying on the borders of Tibet, where the explorer had not only to endure hardships but to face dangers at the hands of robbers, and in some, a sort of civil war was raging. By combining boldness with wariness and tact, he made his way through and discovered a large number of new species of plants, for his aims were chiefly botanical and he brought back with him a great number of seeds of herbaceous plants and shrubs, some of which now adorn English gardens.

NOT a few of the Alpine flowers he collected are of singular beauty. His journeys and researches are recorded in a work of two volumes published in 1918 and entitled "On the Eaves of the World." The drawings he made of the flowers—for he was a skilful artist—were exhibited in London and excited much admiration. Two years ago his love of botany and passion for adventure led him to undertake another no less perilous journey into the mountain wilderness where Northern Burma, China, and Tibet meet, and here, attacked by a sudden malady for which no remedies could be procured at a distance of many days' marches from the outposts of civilization, he died a few months ago. American, as well as British, botanists have cause to mourn the untimely death, in the pursuit of their science, of one of its most ardent and adventurous votaries; and the gardens, both of Europe and of America, will be the poorer by the loss of the new species which he had meant to bring back from a region hitherto unexplored.

QUIETLY enough, no doubt, but with a profound spiritual gratitude many men and women all over the world will turn in their thoughts on the twenty-fifth of this month, which is his sixtieth birthday, to Arthur Schnitzler. It is hard to think of Schnitzler as growing old, though the works even of his youth are tinged with the melancholy of one who has thought his way to the end of things. But side by side with this melancholy he always cultivated a Mozartian gaiety and sparkle which age should not touch nor decay tarnish. His many plays and stories have given him a wide international fame. Yet the spirit and meaning of his art are but ill understood. The stories are more than stories, the plays more than plays. He is the least didactic of writers and the most instructive. By a final and relentless dissection of the soul of man he has given us the fullest sense of its actual complexity and of the necessary relativity of all rough and ready moral values. But his relentlessness has been scientific, never bitter nor personal, and has been coupled with the tenderness of a great physician, and the love of beauty of a great artist. All translations wrong him. The prose both of his narrative and of his dialogue is limpid and exact and supported by a delicate inner rhythm which is the very music of his pity, his understanding, his love. His city is crumbling about him. It may never recover. The finest fruit of its modern civilization is permanently preserved for mankind in his works.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Panama Tolls and American Honor

IF, as is reported to be likely, Congress should now proceed to reestablish the discriminatory Panama canal tolls voted in the Act of 1912 and repealed in 1914, our lawmakers will treat as another scrap of paper a solemnly signed and executed treaty and put the United States in a class with the Germany of 1914. The Panama Canal is ours, but it is ours upon terms, and those terms require us to open the canal to the vessels of all nations without discrimination; we have no right to exempt American ships from canal tolls. When the Senate, in 1912, voted such a tolls exemption, *The Nation* declared that the vote was "a greater disgrace to this country than would have been a naval defeat in the waters off Colon" and pointed out that the act was "in flat disregard of the letter of that treaty, and runs counter to its whole spirit." In 1914, upon the honorable insistence of President Wilson, the exemption was repealed and a black mark wiped off the escutcheon of the United States. It should not be smootched back.

Our rights in Panama go back three quarters of a century, to a time when the Monroe Doctrine was not so far-reaching and paternalistic a conception as it has since become. In 1850 the United States was a young country with no capital to export to South or Central America, expanding within its own borders, only remotely interested in the countries to the south of us, and concerned with trans-isthmian routes chiefly because transcontinental rail lines were not yet laid and much of our commerce with our own West coast passed by the Panaman, Nicaraguan, or Tehuantepec routes. British traders were more active than our own in Central America, Great Britain had territorial interests there which were very ill-defined, and she claimed not only what is today known as British Honduras but a sort of protectorate over the Mosquito Coast of Nicaragua, and a special position in the islands of the Fonseca Bay, commanding the western approach to the Nicaraguan route, as well. Talk of canal construction was current, especially on the Nicaraguan route, and it took new life following the Californian gold rush of '48. But the United States had little capital to invest, and it seemed likely that England might build the canal. Under these circumstances the Clayton-Bulwer convention of 1850 was negotiated, signed, and ratified. Article I of this treaty declared:

> The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship-canal, agreeing that neither will ever erect or maintain any fortifications commanding the same, or in the vicinity thereof, or occupy, or fortify, or colonize, or assume, or exercise any dominion over Nicaragua, Costa Rica, the Mosquito Coast, or any part of Central America; . . . nor will the United States or Great Britain take advantage of any intimacy, or use any alliance, connection, or influence that either may possess, with any state or government through whose territory the said canal may pass, for the purpose of acquiring or holding, directly or indirectly, for the citizens or subjects of the one, any rights or advantages in regard to the commerce or navigation of the said canal which shall not be offered on the same terms to the citizens or subjects of the other.

At the time this treaty seemed to be a good bargain for the United States. Half a century later, when we had become a World Power, when the Monroe Doctrine was growing under President Roosevelt's careful cultivation, when the United States was ready to begin building a canal with its own capital, the treaty seemed only an obstruction. Under these changed circumstances, Mr. Roosevelt's Secretary of State negotiated a new treaty, the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, concluded November 18, 1901, and proclaimed February 22, 1902, in which Great Britain renounced much of the special position granted her in the earlier agreement. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty expressly superseded the Clayton-Bulwer Convention; it declared further that the

> canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States . . . and that subject to the provisions of the present treaty the said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such construction as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the canal.

The provisions of the treaty to which this right was subject were the adoption of a set of canal rules based upon those applied by the British Government in operation of the Suez Canal. Of these Rule One, the most important, read:

> The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

That is the binding clause. Great Britain had greater rights under the old treaty. She gave them up in exchange for only this, giving her ships and those of all nations equality of treatment, in conditions and charges, with the ships of the United States. We cannot violate that solemn pledge without condemning ourselves before the bar of the world as a nation which refuses to keep its plighted word. Our right even to fortify the canal under that treaty was questionable, but Sir Edward Grey renounced the British claim against such fortification in November, 1912, in a note to Secretary Knox declaring that "Now that the United States has become the practical sovereign of the canal, His Majesty's Government do not question its title to exercise belligerent rights for its protection." When the tolls bill exempting American ships was passed, in Mr. Taft's Administration, Great Britain solemnly protested. After a long fight in which the better sense and self-respect of the American people triumphed, that bill was repealed in 1914. It was a notable victory for right. We cannot believe that the American people wish their nation to be less honorable today than in 1914. Indeed, we can only repeat what we said at the time of the British protest in July, 1912:

> Now we know that the nation's honor and the nation's duty are touched. We see the danger of trying to drive a subsidy coach-and-four through a precisely worded treaty. If such a thing could be done, American faith would get as bad a name as Punic. No boasting and no protestations of good motives would avail, for we should have placed this country in a situation like that described by John Quincy Adams in his "Diary": "Any effort on our part to reason the world out of a belief that we are ambitious will have no other effect than to convince them that we add to our ambition hypocrisy."

Commercial rivalry makes villains of us all, and commercial rivalry is nowhere more keen than in the carrying trade of the world by sea; but in the long run national interests and national honor will be found to be not far apart.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Railroad Problem Again

WE gladly give a page in this issue to letters on the railroad problem from President Willard of the Baltimore and Ohio Company, and from Mr. S. Davies Warfield, president of the Association of Owners of Railroad Securities. If space permitted, we should gladly set aside at least a page each week to present all sides of a subject which more and more fills the daily press with statements so directly contradictory as sorely to puzzle the ordinary newspaper reader. We had, of course, no intention of misrepresenting Mr. Warfield's position, but we had naturally thought that when he and his association felt compelled to devise the extremely complicated machinery of some fifty boards so soon after the passage of the Esch-Cummins Law this at least indicated a belief that the new law had left much undone, and to that extent had failed. As for President Willard's rejoinder, we certainly cannot share his optimism as to the railroad labor situation; nor would a perusal of even a week's labor dispatches warrant us in so doing. But we are quite willing to accept his assurance that labor conditions on the Baltimore and Ohio are better than we had supposed. On the other hand, there has been much labor testimony within the last two weeks before the Railway Labor Board that the railroad employees are not satisfied with present wages, much less ready to accept any "deflation." Inquiry in Congress shows, moreover, much dissatisfaction with the results of the Esch-Cummins Law even among those who voted for it, and Senator Cummins is himself busily inquiring into what is wrong.

With that inquiry we are heartily in sympathy. In the debate which has been going on between the economists of the railway unions—who are formidably attacking the railway executives from a new angle—and the railroads there should be some arbiter to pass upon the merits of the controversy in the interest of the public. *The Nation* may be biased in believing that the railroad executives are more than ever on the defensive, but that it does believe. The burden of proof is upon them, both as to the Esch-Cummins Act and as to the efficiency—now so gravely challenged—of their own management. The Railway Labor Board's decision will throw some light upon these questions, and a Congressional inquiry also, but an even more judicial tribunal would be welcome. The fact is that after a year of the Esch-Cummins Act the situation of the railroads is worse than ever, the new rates are so high that every shipper knows they are killing business—New York City is so much in danger of a vegetable and fruit famine this summer, because of prohibitive rates, that the Shipping Board is being besought to run steamers direct from California to the Atlantic ports in order to prevent an actual dearth of vital foodstuffs. The railroads maintain that it is not the rates but the general business depression which is responsible for the thousands of idle locomotives and freight cars, so they are asking for the deflation of labor, without, however, any suggestion that they are ready for a reduction of rates. Yet those rates were given them chiefly for the purpose of paying the last increase in wages. If those wages are reduced, the rates should go down likewise. It is our sober judgment that if they do a long step will have been taken toward the revival of business; the high rates were plainly not responsible for a world-wide, after-the-war depression, but they have intensified it. Every manufacturer knows this to be true.

Later we hope to go more into detail of the charges made by Mr. W. Jett Lauck for the railway unions. Today we wish to stress again, and emphatically, certain phases of the situation which are above and beyond the Esch-Cummins Act and are so fundamental in the controversy that we wish every reader to keep them clearly in mind. They are first and foremost that the issue has now clearly come down to the point where the country will soon be called upon to decide between government ownership plus private operation, (or operation by employees), or government ownership and operation, or private ownership approximating a monopoly and highly controlled and regulated by the Government. It is toward the latter that Mr. Warfield's association tends—we sincerely trust that we do not again misunderstand him. His plan calls for the incorporation of the National Railway Service "as an agency to purchase cars and other equipment to be furnished to the railroads without profit" and to coordinate "facilities and service and to otherwise assist in economically producing adequate transportation." We find it difficult to see wherein this will differ seriously from a monopoly-operating company; it certainly seems to prove that Mr. Warfield's association believes with Mr. Lauck that the methods of purchase of supplies have been and are wrong. It is surely a plan to finance and operate all the roads as one unit with, as has been said, "the connivance and financial backing of the Federal Government." This is going to the very verge of government ownership and we are frank to believe that it savors so strongly of a monopoly as to be impossible—at least impossible for long.

For it would strengthen the present Wall Street control of the railroads. The railway executives may berate and denounce Mr. Lauck and Senator La Follette all they please, but they cannot deny that twenty-five bankers and executives, interlocking directors, control and link together ninety-nine Class I railroads which operate 211,280 miles of road, 82 per cent of the country's steam railroads, and that this means that the railroads are not operated primarily in the interest of the public, or of the employees, or even of the bulk of the security holders, but for the benefit of the rings within rings in Wall Street. Here lies the great issue. Are the railroads to be run for shippers and public, or for the benefit of the executives and directors and bankers? President A. H. Smith of the New York Central has taken the latter standpoint and, as a result, has invited upon himself a stinging and just rebuke from President Haley Fiske of the Metropolitan Life for protesting because Mr. Fiske, Mr. Warfield and other holders of securities dared to inquire directly of labor whether there was not a way by which all concerned could, by pulling together, solve the existing problems. So brilliant an executive as Mr. Fiske must see very clearly where this sort of arrogant and arbitrary control will inevitably lead us to: to public ownership by purchase upon a fair valuation of our transportation lines, so that they may be operated for service at cost, with the profit-making idea eventually eliminated from the whole system, just as Mr. Warfield now proposes to eliminate it from the purchase of supplies and thus end unquestionable and far-reaching grafting and favoritism in other roads besides the New Haven under Mellen.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No War With England

V. Oil

PETROLEUM, in its short and stormy life as a commercial product, has had an extraordinary effect on human relationships. First used in humble lamps and stoves, and as a lubricant, it drove the whaling fleets of New Bedford and Nantucket to their last moorings. An age of prospecting and wild speculation resulted in the creation of the giant monopoly whose founder has been rewarded by the largest fortune in the world's history. The perfection of the gasoline engine, and the consequent development of the automobile, the motor truck, the tractor, and the aeroplane have fostered a series of great industries which have gone far to transform the life of peaceful communities, and are indispensable in war. Last of all has come the use of heavy oil as a fuel in ships, both under steam boilers and in internal-combustion engines of the Diesel type. This development, almost within the last five years, now causes danger to international harmony. As the *Manchester Guardian* has said, "The question of oil tends to overshadow all other international problems."

A vessel burning oil is far more efficient than one burning coal for the simple reason that a given weight and bulk of oil will produce more heat than the same weight and bulk of coal. In warships the advantages of oil are so marked that both American and British navies will soon depend exclusively upon it. Oil-burning destroyers enabled us to defeat the German submarine campaign; Earl Curzon said truly that "the Allied fleets floated to victory on a sea of oil." The Diesel motor ship is about 2½ times more efficient even than the oil-burning steamship. If it were certain that oil would be as plentiful and as cheap as coal, oil ships would drive coal ships off the seas as surely within the next fifteen years as steamships drove sailing vessels off the best trade routes in the past fifty. If, on the other hand, the supply of fuel oil is inadequate, those ships which have access to it will have an enormous advantage over those which have not.

When this state of affairs began to be apparent, about the time of the beginning of the Great War, it looked as if the United States would be enabled thereby to upset, if she wished, Britain's mastery of the seas. While hardly any oil is to be found in the United Kingdom, over 60 per cent of the world's supply has for years come from within our borders. And it was Britain's large and cheap supply of coal, and her string of coaling stations around the earth, that had been one of the chief factors in her control of ocean shipping. Suddenly, by virtue of the invention of new technical processes and an accident in the distribution of natural resources, England saw the very foundation of her merchant marine and her navy about to slip away.

Although American oil fields are the best developed, they are by no means the only potential resources. More than one-half the world's recoverable petroleum lies in two great areas: one in North America and in South American countries bordering the Caribbean Sea, and the other in Western Asia and Southeastern Europe lying about the Caucasus as an axis. These two fields are of nearly equal importance. Strangely enough, they are not far from the two great interoceanic canals—Panama and Suez. In 2 per cent of the world's area rests about 30 per cent of the world's future supply of petroleum, and about this 2 per cent pivot most of the forces of international politics today. There are also sizable deposits of oil on other trade routes—such as those in Borneo, India, Japan, and Argentina.

While we were resting in the knowledge of our resources, foreign companies went energetically and quietly to work gaining control of the undeveloped fields. The Mexican Eagle Company, a British concern, received large concessions in Mexico. The Shell interests, another British group, invested heavily in many parts of the world. The Royal Dutch Company, originally in appearance at least a Dutch concern, was formed to exploit oil in the Dutch East Indies. Behind it was the financial power of the Rothschilds. Later occurred a merger of the Royal Dutch and the Shell companies under British control, and the Mexican Eagle Company came under their wing. The Anglo-Persian Company was formed to exploit fields in Persia and the Near East, the British Government, on account of the needs of the navy, furnishing £2,000,000 of the capital and retaining control. This company now has close affiliations with the Royal Dutch-Shell. This gigantic aggregation of British oil interests, with its subsidiaries, now owns or controls a large share of the oil deposits in California, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mexico, Trinidad, Venezuela, Colombia, Rumania, Russia, Persia, Egypt, India, and the East Indies. Except in North America, most of its concessions are virtually so large as to exclude American companies from the most promising fields.

In the meantime experts of the United States Geological Survey came to disquieting conclusions. Perhaps 40 per cent of the petroleum originally in the ground of the United States has already been exhausted, and if the present rate of production continues even without increase, our oil may be entirely gone in from fifteen to twenty years. Domestic demand, moreover, has risen so rapidly that for the past two years we have had to import more oil than we exported. In 1920 the excess of oil imports over exports was nearly 100,000,000 barrels, or over one-sixth of our entire consumption. And British interests, in close affiliation with the British Government, now have exclusive control, according to Captain Foley of the United States Shipping Board, of between 90 and 97 per cent of the future visible supply of the world. A dramatic reversal indeed!

American interests quickly went to work to restore the balance. But they have found their pathway blocked. The Department of State, in response to a resolution of inquiry moved by Senator Gore, reported that while the United States had always maintained the "open door" to foreign investors and purchasers in its own oil resources, other nations, by national ownership or exclusive concessions, had shut the door to their resources against American interests. It is the exclusive policy that causes the trouble. In the first place, American oil owners wish to protect their investments by substituting new and fruitful properties for those which are likely to run dry. In the second place, the United States Navy and the shipping interests want to be assured of a future bunker supply without the possibility of discrimination.

The chief area of dispute at present seems to be Mesopo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tamia. Here the British group just before the war had received a concession from the Turkish Government, a quarter of which they had to share with the Deutsche Bank. After the war, the German share was claimed by Great Britain as part of the spoils of victory. France, however, put in a claim for the German share also, and eventually received it, in exchange for British control of the exploitation of deposits in the French colonies. This arrangement, consummated in secret at San Remo, cemented an Anglo-French oil entente, and American interests find themselves barred from the rich possibilities of Mesopotamia, as well as from a major part of the French market. Our State Department has protested on the ground that the open door must be maintained in mandatories. Great Britain agrees in principle, but maintains that since her concession antedates the war it must be recognized, open door or no open door. A long diplomatic correspondence has ensued. The real issue is that British companies have the oil, and that American interests want part of it. For us whose chief interest is peace, the important thing to remember is that in this crucial controversy there is a substantial identity between the British Government and British capital on the one hand, and between the American State Department and American oil interests on the other.

In his last annual report, Secretary Lane wrote that the oil situation "calls for a policy prompt, determined, looking many years ahead." He recommended three immediate governmental policies, one of which was a refusal to sell oil to any vessel under foreign registry if its government discriminates against American ships or oil interests. President Walter C. Teagle of the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey addressed these significant sentences to the 1920 convention of the American Petroleum Institute: "If foreign governments insist on pursuing the policy of nationalizing oil lands and reserving subsoil rights to be held under government direction; if they persist in attempting to keep all of their own petroleum deposits for their own future benefit, while relying upon the United States for a large share of their present needs, then, and in that event, this nation will have no alternative but to take cognizance of the attitude of foreign governments, and as a matter of necessary self-protection to consider the adoption of means reciprocally to conserve its petroleum resources for its own people. . . . *With its position in world trade and the economic and financial weapons ready to hand, the United States could undoubtedly compel a new allotment of foreign territory so as to give it a share of what other nations are proposing to keep for themselves.*"

As if in response to these statements, Secretary Daniels as one of his last official acts wrote a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, recommending the passage of a bill which would give the President power to impose an embargo on exports of oil from the United States, whenever in his opinion the situation should warrant such an act. Although this measure is only one of the "economic and financial weapons" which Mr. Teagle must have had in mind, its application alone would be drastic, since it would forbid the British companies from exporting their own oil from their extensive properties in the United States—an act which our Government would strongly resent if it were applied against us by any other nation.

Statements about "nationalization" of oil are ordinarily understood to apply to Mexico, and no doubt they do, in part. But we must not forget that the quarrel over Mexican oil is a three-cornered one, and that intervention by the United States would undoubtedly involve trouble with England unless a previous arrangement should assure her of what she might regard as an equitable share of the spoils.

Righteous argument will not cause either side to give way. How little impression it makes may be inferred from a passage in the speech of Sir Charles Greenway, Bt., chairman of the Anglo-Persian Oil Company, Ltd., to its last annual meeting. Speaking of the controversy with the United States, Sir Charles said: "I would like to refer to the pathetic account which was given recently in the press of the enormous sacrifices which the United States had made in depleting itself—not without valuable consideration, be it remembered—of its reserves of oil for the benefit of the rest of the world. This was made the basis for claiming that American producers are entitled to their share in future oilfields outside of America as well as the enormous ones in the United States and elsewhere which they already hold. I am now wondering when we shall see similar demands put forward by the Bolshevists in regard to the oil supplied to other countries from Baku during the last 30 or 40 years and from the gold producers in South Africa and even from our own colliery proprietors for the gold and coal of which they have depleted themselves—for the welfare of the rest of the world!" (Laughter.)

If there were a real League of Peace, its first business would be to internationalize the oil supply, conserve it for the most vital uses like lubrication and shipping, drastically limit its consumption in pleasure cars, and ration it among the peoples of the world according to need. There being no possibility of such a league while Anglo-Persian and Standard Oil Companies continue to exist, no such intelligent policy can be pursued. Of course, the parties at interest may arrange things temporarily by dividing the field. But there is danger of something else. If you have a navy, you must have oil. If you have oil, you must have a navy. If you have a navy without enough oil, you must have a bigger navy than that of someone else who has the oil, so that he cannot refuse it to you. If you have a navy with lots of oil to protect, you must have a bigger navy than someone else who has a navy without oil, so that he cannot deprive your navy of oil the moment war breaks out. And then, if you haven't enough oil, you must exert pressure through finance and commerce and shipping, and if you have more than enough oil, you must keep ownership of the oil so that you can sell it and so meet the pressure of competing finance and commerce and shipping. So it goes while one piece after another is brought into play on the great chess board, and someone may rashly precipitate action by taking a pawn.

The problem of oil is, to be sure, only a minor one in the course of the centuries; before many years are gone petroleum may be entirely exhausted, or may be superseded by some other source of power such as alcohol. Nevertheless, it constitutes a present danger to the peace of the world, and we might possibly witness the grotesque comedy of the human race endangering its very existence in a quarrel for possession of a fuel which has not been in use more than sixty years and may not be used sixty years from now. The trouble over oil is a perfect symbol of the trouble with the whole present organization of human relationships.*

* The next article in this series will deal with the question of the financial relations of the two Anglo-Saxon countries.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Haiti Speaks

NO graver indictment of an American Administration has ever been made than is contained in the temperately written thirty-thousand-word Memoir of the Delegates to the United States of the Haitian Patriotic Union outlining the history of the American Occupation in Haiti which was presented to the Department of State and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week.* Despite its moderation, it more than confirms every charge made in *The Nation* in the last year. The first official pronouncement from the Haitians themselves—for a rigid military censorship sealed their lips for five years—it establishes that our conquest of Haiti was neither justified under any principle of international law nor sanctioned by any conceivable necessity. It should finally put an end to all the excuses alleged in our defense—such as the protection of American interests, restoration of order, suppression of banditry, bad Haitian finances, etc. The report again makes plain that the local revolutionary disturbances of July 28, 1915, merely furnished a long-sought pretext for intervention, that our interests were in no wise imperiled, that far from there being disorder when the marines landed it was their brutalities which created and then perpetuated the previously non-existent "Caco-ism," a banditry not of crime but of revolt against the alien invasion. The state of the Haitian finances is lucidly set forth—they were by no means in a tangle; the external and internal debt of the country had always been fully paid until the American Occupation inaugurated an era of mismanagement (to put it charitably) quite unprecedented under Haitian control. The appended list of atrocities it is difficult for an American to read without shame and horror. It does not purport to be a complete record. On the contrary, it is limited to the comparatively few cases called, in writing, to the attention of the Naval Court of Inquiry sent to Haiti last fall by Secretary Daniels to offset Senator Harding's campaign attack, and published, upon the refusal of the Court to consider them, in the newspapers of Port-au-Prince. Murder of women and children, wholesale killing of prisoners, torture with red-hot irons, the "water cure," arson, robbery, violence of every kind—they constitute an everlasting stain on American honor.

If this report does not arouse the American people then its conscience is indeed dead. *The Nation* cannot believe that it is and that all our professions of good faith, decency, fair play, all our great and honorable traditions upheld for nearly a century and a half, can be thus lightly cast on the scrap-heap. Here is a small and inoffensive country, next to our own the oldest republic in this hemisphere, self-governing for 111 years, a republic which achieved one sort of freedom fifty years before our own (for it abolished slavery when it became independent), made the victim of wholly wanton, brutal, militaristic conquest. These are facts that cannot be whitewashed, propagandized, or lied away. It matters little what President Harding said at the foot of the statue of Bolivar, or what fine phrases President Wilson uttered. What really counts—the acid test—is what we have done and what we shall do to little Haiti, the one country which, by a curious irony, made a really substantial contribution to the cause of Bolivar and South American freedom while we stood aloof.

*The Memoir will be printed in full in the International Relations Section of the next issue of The Nation.

The Courage of Your Conventions

THERE was once an honest young lady who for some worried weeks had been reading the deeds and words of Hermione—Don Marquis's Hermione, that foolish virgin whose words always come true to form. The honest young lady grew desperate, and confessed: "But now I don't dare say anything any more at all. Everything I want to say I have already seen in Hermione, or I am afraid I may see if there tomorrow." "Ah," replied the sage to whom this honest young lady had made her serious admission, "you haven't the courage of your conventions."

This phrase, dearly beloved, has a lesson for all of us. How few, indeed, in our slack and slippery age, have the courage of their conventions! Here and there a few may be found who hold by their convictions through thick and thin. But another courage is necessary to hold by the ancient, the approved forms of language and decorum. Propriety is as timid as the ground hog on his proper day. It sees its shadow and ducks back into its hole. "Well," says Propriety, "I may be old-fashioned, but——" What then? Does Propriety go on with the sentence and say: "I think that woman's place is the home"? No, it limply says: "I think a woman ought to be as domestic as possible." Oh, scandalous concession! Or Propriety begins thus: "I don't know anything about art, but——" Once the continuation would have been clear, peremptory, strong: "I know what I like." In our degenerate decade it emerges falteringly, something like this, for instance: "I have a kind of instinct for my own peculiar preferences." Or for a third and last illustration, Propriety bursts out: "I know what I want to say but——" The honorable conclusion is: "I can't find the words." Lamely, tamely, Propriety now ends up: "I have an inhibition, a sort of impediment of expression, that keeps me from uttering all that is in me." In a little while who will have the moral energy to say: "I stand for liberty but not for license"?

The courage of your conventions! It is this, dearly beloved, which has made us what we are. But for it what would have been the fate of the Espionage Act? But for it where would there be such an organization as the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice? Without it, how could we find Congressmen enough to run this Government? The courage of your conventions is the mortar which holds the stones of our institutions together. Once free and flowing, it hardens into the strength of stone if we let it. And we must let it. The modern tendency has most damnably been to insist that life should be kept free and flowing. Consider the horrid consequences. Today the least yielding of reactionaries wears the mask of liberalism. He vociferates: "I am as much a friend of labor as any man." He demands that we keep the country free and equal as in all the great days of the country's history. And, as to conservative journalism, it dares not show its hand, however much it shows its face. It makes no ringing assault upon the excesses of the young, upon the advance of error; it weakly reviews the times without the roaring or rollicking insolence of absolute security; and by its timidity it reveals the general tone of the age. Who, dearly beloved, will lead us back from the morass into which our radicals have led us, to the impregnable rock where

> Conventions on convictions stand
> And competently rule the land?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Collapse of the Triple Alliance

By FELIX MORLEY

London, April 16

ENGLAND has just passed through one of the most amazing crises of her history. In two short weeks she has seen the cloud which to most was no larger than a man's hand, spread with the rapidity of fire and cover the whole industrial sky. From London to South Wales and northward to the banks of the Clyde she has heard the rumblings of that which Communist miner and Unionist banker agreed to call attempted revolution. She has seen the streets of her cities placarded with posters of a national emergency and echoing with the tramp of regiments in war equipment; motor trucks and houses have been commandeered for military purposes, volunteers for the National Defense Force have rolled up in tens of thousands to swamp hastily established recruiting offices, English warships have trained their guns on the docks of English cities, and the parks of London, closed to visitors, are still, as in 1914, lined with tents and filled with marching men.

And now, as quickly as it rose, without the loss of a single life by violence, the danger of upheaval on a nation-wide and concerted basis has passed from the horizon of the average middle-class Englishman. The strength of labor, which a few days ago seemed united and defiant as never before, has faded like smoke before the massed forces of Capital and Government. The Triple Alliance, on paper the most powerful body in the world of labor, has failed on the eve of action. Close to a million miners, sullen and stupefied by the turn of events, are continuing their fight alone and the Government is curtailing none of its emergency precautions. But by and large Lloyd George has met the enemy and they are his. "It is no use trying to minimize it," says this morning's *Daily Herald*. "It is no use pretending that it is other than it is. Yesterday was the heaviest defeat that has befallen the labor movement within the memory of man."

To students of the industrial situation emergence of serious trouble was assured when at the end of February the Government announced its intention of removing war-time control of the coal industry on March 31, five months ahead of the date originally appointed by statute. It is at least interesting that as early as this a wedge was driven between the miners and railwaymen by keeping the date of decontrolling the railways at August 31, originally the day on which coal decontrol was scheduled. To the miners, coming when it did, decontrol meant utter collapse of the plan for establishing a uniform national system of wage payments with the conjunct maintenance of a financial pool for the industry as a whole. Admission and consideration of both these contentions were won by the strike last autumn, and the abrupt manner in which Lloyd George has now swept them aside seems to the miners a repetition of his tactics with regard to the recommendations of the Sankey Commission. But far more important to the labor movement as a whole was the frontal attack on wages involved in decontrol of the mines. The new wage scales beginning April 1, the owners blithely announced, would in some cases be 50 per cent less than those terminated by government decontrol. In many of the less productive districts the miners' new wages amount to no more than 15 or 16 shillings a week in pre-war values. In South Wales, which is a wealthy field, a general laborer under the new scale would receive 32 shillings a week where before the war, with living costs about one-third of what they are today, he made 29 shillings a week. The attack on wages was brazen, heartless, and sweeping. All contracts were terminated on March 31 and the miners told they could return to work at the new scales or not at all. It is because they refused to come to heel on these starvation wages that the present dispute is judged a lockout and not a strike.

To understand what happened it is necessary to summarize the events of the vitally important week from April 8 to April 15. They show how anxiously and sincerely the trade-union leaders worked for a peace which would be both just and honorable. They also reveal a hostility to revolutionary methods which has caused English Communists to characterize the events of this week as "the Great Betrayal."

On the morning of April 8 the lockout of the miners had been a week in progress. The Government, long prepared for this emergency, stood solidly behind the owners in refusing pointblank to countenance the miners' demands for a National Wages Board and a National Wage Pool, although five months ago steps leading to the establishment of the former had been officially conceded. On April 8 the resources of the miners, already strained by their strike last autumn, were beginning to run low. Accordingly the two other members of the Triple Alliance (railwaymen and transport workers) on that day voted to come to the miners' aid. Both these organizations realized that in fighting against wage reductions the miners were fighting their battle and deserved their aid.

It should, however, be kept in mind that the Triple Alliance was not bound to any effort of united action. Its constitution, while reserving complete autonomy to each member body to act on its own behalf, states that "no movement shall be instituted by any of the affiliated bodies if it is likely to involve the others, until it has been submitted to the joint body for consideration." The Triple Alliance was ready to strike against the miners' reduced wages and sanctioned such action. It was not ready, although at first a contrary impression was given, to strike for the miners' political demands nor did it sanction a general strike for that end. In the failure to make this distinction clear at the outset—in trying a bluff which Lloyd George called—is found the real reason of the collapse. The policy of the miners in refusing to separate the issues of wages and industrial policy proved faulty. The policy of railwaymen and transport workers in leading the miners to think they would support them without this separation of issues proved fatal.

At the meeting on April 8 it seems to have been the desire of some few of the two involved executives to call a lightning strike for April 10. This was overruled by a majority, including J. H. Thomas and Robert Williams, who desired a week's notice. A compromise decision was made to send out provisional strike notices to all rail and transport locals for midnight of April 12. The Government immediately hastened its preparations for possible revolution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On April 11 negotiations between the mine owners and miners were resumed, the Government having dropped its decision that there could be no further parleys unless the pumpmen first returned to insure that the mines would not be flooded. On their side the miners agreed not to interfere with any volunteer pumpmen. The negotiations were continued on April 12 while the Government was rushing troops into London and industrial centers, enrolling volunteers by tens of thousands, and commandeering lorries and omnibuses to organize an emergency transport service. Because of these negotiations the strike was postponed, although three hours before it was due the coal negotiations had broken down completely because the Government and the owners again refused consideration of either the unified national scale of wage payments or the national pool.

The miners' executive then asked for a strike of the full Triple Alliance at midnight April 13. It was called instead for ten p.m., April 15. Other unions, particularly the electrical workers, promised to come out in sympathy. People dimly realized that when the crisis came English cities would at first be without electricity, gas, perhaps even water. The cooperative societies offered labor food, credit, and financial assistance. Strike committees, labor relief associations, local "councils of action" were formed all over the country. The Government landed marines, hurried troops and artillery back from Ireland, issued proclamations, and hastened its emergency arrangements for maintenance of transport and public utilities. Further efforts at compromise failed because the miners refused to treat the wage reductions as an isolated issue.

On the night of April 14 an unorganized group of some 200 members of the House of Commons took it into their own hands to try and find an eleventh-hour outlet from the crisis. They summoned certain representative mine owners to state their position on the drastic wage reductions, which, it is admitted, was found unsatisfactory. At ten p.m., just 24 hours before the transport strike was due, they called Frank Hodges, secretary of the Miners' Federation, to what developed into a two hours' hearing and cross-examination. During the latter Hodges suggested that the miners would probably accept a temporary agreement on the subject of wages alone, provided later recognition of the principle of a National Wages Board was not jeopardized thereby. At one o'clock the morning of April 15 this information was hurried to Lloyd George. Immediately he suggested to mine owners and miners a renewal of negotiations, at 10:30 that morning. The owners appeared; the miners did not.

For on this morning of April 15 the full miners' executive, realizing how often before they have been tricked by the Government, had (it is said by one vote) overruled Hodges and refused to parley further until the two principles of the National Wages Board and the National Pool are definitely conceded. Hodges offered his resignation, but none would permit it to be accepted. He again assumed leadership and informed Lloyd George of the decision.

Following this dramatic turn Thomas and Cramp of the railwaymen, Gosling and Williams of the transport workers—all deeply anxious to avert the horrors of threatened civil war—together informed the miners' executive that in their opinion negotiations should be resumed on the basis of Hodges's suggestion before the members of Parliament. The miners refused, and shortly after four p.m., on April 15, it was announced from railway headquarters at Unity House that the general strike scheduled for ten o'clock that night had been definitely called off. Alone and defiant, hard-pressed financially, and feeling themselves deserted by their fellows of the Triple Alliance the miners are continuing their fight. The Government announces that there will be no suspension of its military and anti-revolutionary activity. Among the members of the Federation of British Industries there is mutual congratulation and jubilation, coupled with discussion of the advisability of permanently shackling trade-union strength by legislation making sympathetic strikes a criminal offense.

To labor sympathizers the collapse of the Triple Alliance is a staggering blow. Today the industrial solidarity of British labor, the work of a quarter century of patient toil, is smashed. In every section of the country miners are proclaiming that they have been "disgracefully deserted" and that the leaders of the railwaymen and transport workers will regret their action when they face a similar attack on their own wages. On the other hand it is certain that if the miners' leaders had confined themselves to the dollar and cents aspect of the wage question, as Hodges was willing to concede, they would not have been abandoned. On the question of wages alone they have an unanswerable case, and widespread sympathy both in Parliament and among the public. Instead of concentrating on this their major efforts were centered on the issue of industrial organization. Not only is the meaning of the National Wages Board and the Pool for the Industry but dimly understood by many of the railwaymen and transport workers, but also the attention paid to these demands weakens the miners' originally valid contention that they are not striking but "locked out." However desirable the question of unification and central control for the entire coal industry, it was not one on which many of the other members of the Triple Alliance were prepared to go out on a sympathetic strike, certain to lead to violence, if not more serious results. It was not even an issue properly sanctioned by the two other executives. The strike could have been called and enough railwaymen and transport workers would have responded to throw the whole nation into chaos—but what then? That was the question which Thomas and Cramp, Gosling and Bob Williams had to face—and not being Bolsheviks they quailed before the answer.

The Triple Alliance was a loose-knit, horizontal combination of three great unions, each in itself a federation. The split which has shattered it cuts vertically through structure without regard to trade groupings. On the right side of this fissure stand the trade unionists of traditional "constitutional" type, still a great majority of both railwaymen and transport workers. On the left stand those who have lost faith in parliamentary practice and evolution, and are ready to try short-cuts to the reformation of society. They are in a majority among the miners and are growing in numbers in the other unions, but they are as yet far the weaker section. Inevitably the result of the last few days will be to widen the breach and make effective cooperation much more difficult. Perhaps the advent of communism made this inevitable, and there are some who argue that it will be, in the long run, beneficial. Certain it is that in both the industrial and political fields there is now going to be a very thorough overhauling, repairing, and replacement of machinery which has failed to meet the test of action. But however these efforts may turn out that which stands out now is the fact that the debacle has broken that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solidarity which for many years has proved the greatest strength of British labor.

Nor does the opposing side intend to let its opportunity slide. Says today's *Morning Post:* "There is a growing opinion among other (than labor) quarters of the House that the Government should now take steps to put some curb on the power of these great trade unions to threaten the dislocation of the life of the nation for purposes which are political and not economic." Powerful interests are eager to break the strength of English trade unionism now as completely as French trade unionism was broken after the railway strike fiasco there a year ago. In England the offensive has passed into the hands of capital.

In the Court of Press-Made Opinion

By WALTER NELLES

INSCRIBED beneath a full-page portrait of Tito Ligi in an illustrated daily paper a week after his arrest:

This is the first intimate picture to be published of Tito Ligi, who is said to have been identified in Scranton, Pa., by a government witness as the driver of the death wagon that caused the fatal explosion in Wall Street, September 16. Although this one witness is certain Ligi is the man long sought as the missing link in the chain of evidence that would clear up the mystery, there are others who differ. What do you think?

The case of Ligi illustrates a sinister process.

He is an Italian workingman, resident at Scranton. He was arrested on April 19 charged with being a draft evader. For four days he was interrogated by detectives and not allowed to see his family or even his lawyer.

Publicity "broke" in the afternoon papers of the day after his arrest. The news items on that day were mysterious—a "Wall Street bomb suspect" was in custody at Scranton—name not stated—reason for suspecting him not stated—inspiration of news not stated.

Detectives, "bomb squad" men, special agents of the United States Department of Justice flocked about Ligi in the Scranton jail. Eager news-hounds flocked about the detectives. The detectives were careful in their public statements; none of them suggested any charge against Ligi other than that of draft evasion. The head-lines, however, continually featured Ligi as a "bomb suspect." And the news-hounds either concocted or absorbed melodrama. They noised it across the United States that Tito Ligi lived over an abandoned coal mine—a reasonably safe statement to make of almost any resident of Scranton. For the city is built upon a thin crust of earth, supported by pillars of anthracite as slim as the law will permit the mining companies to leave them. It was further noised over the country that the underlying mine was connected with Ligi's dwelling by a subterranean passage—a romantic falsehood. There was no such connection. To give color of verisimilitude to this falsehood, the papers attached to Ligi a house two blocks away which had nothing to do with him, where, however, there are in fact two small holes from which coal had been taken, one under the cellar and under the garden. These holes are not connected either with each other or with any mine shaft, and are used simply as dumps for ashes and refuse.

Further, in journalese, "most interesting of all the developments which have leaked out despite the attempt at secrecy" was the story that some men emerged from a mine somewhere about Scranton one night and exploded in a field, apparently for experimental purposes, a bomb they were supposed to have made in the mine. No ground was suggested for supposing that Ligi had anything to do with any such episode. I could not learn any basis in fact for the story itself. Blasting is, of course, ordinary in Scranton, and dynamite more familiar than pop-corn.

Pieces of sash-weights are said to have been found about the scene of the Wall Street explosion. Sash-weights were the material of the real triumph of incriminating ingenuity in the Ligi romance. It was first reported that there was a sash-weight factory in Scranton; next, that pieces of sash-weights had been found there in a vacant lot, perhaps deposited by the "test bomb"; finally, that a box of sash-weights had been found in the rear of the restaurant at which Ligi had worked. The papers did not trouble to add that Ligi's connection with the restaurant in question had not commenced until over a month after the Wall Street explosion; they did not explain why a supposed perpetrator of the Wall Street disaster should go from place to place attended by sash-weights. One paper, however, had the fairness to report the truth about the pieces of metal found by detectives in the restaurant—"that they were not pieces of window-weights, as at first supposed, but were irregular blocks of iron and steel such as are used by Italians in the city playing a game somewhat like quoits."

It would be tedious to enumerate all the clap-trap auxiliaries of what might easily have become a journalistic lynching. Toward the end of Ligi's week's career on the front page, some public attention was called to the fustian character of the "case" against him, and one newspaper man was bold enough to intimate that the "identification" of Ligi by a person who had previously studied his photograph was unreliable. On April 26, Chief Flynn of the Secret Service, answering a letter of protest from Carlo Tresca, wrote:

The attention of this Department was called to Ligi by the Scranton Police Department, whereupon a number of witnesses who made statements concerning the Wall Street explosion of September, 1920, were called upon to look at the photograph of Ligi which was placed with twenty-five others. Three witnesses, Clark, Nally, and Smith, selected from these photographs that of Ligi as resembling the man they saw at the wagon containing the explosive. These three men were asked to go to Scranton with the view to identifying the suspect. Two of them failed to identify Ligi; the third witness, Smith, seemed to be positive that Ligi was the man he saw at the wagon on Wall Street last September. Frankly, I think he is mistaken.

From this time the case of Tito Ligi rapidly receded from the front page. But with slight differences in nearness to the terrible event and in popular reaction, it might easily have stayed there with fatal result. People at large did not make up their minds against Ligi with quite sufficient velocity, vehemence, mass, and momentum. Yet, although there was not, from beginning to end, any intimation of probable ground or reason why Tito Ligi at Scranton, rather than any other obscure Italian or non-Italian workingman anywhere else in the United States, was chosen to be a subject of speculation as to the probability of his guilt of heinous crime on the basis of his physiognomy, a great many people did make up their minds against him. And the sources of what passes for information, with substantial unanimity, abetted.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Turgenev and His Heroes

By JACOB ZEITLIN

OF Russia's great novelists Turgenev[1] is the one who comes nearest to the apprehension of the western reader. His world of men and women presents no striking abnormalities, his portraiture hardly ever invades the province of pathology, his view of life reasonably satisfies our standards of sanity, and his art has the chastity and restraint of the best European tradition. To impute this result to the influence upon him of western culture might be misleading. His literary powers attained their maturity on Russian soil and his art followed the path that had been blazed by his great countrymen, Pushkin and Gogol. But it is also true that he became conscious at an early age of the great need in Russia of the fertilizing elements from a richer cultivation and dedicated himself with missionary enthusiasm to the importation of those elements from abroad. Hence the self-imposed exile which lasted through nearly his whole creative career. What one is likely to overlook, however, is how perfectly Turgenev embodied in himself certain of the fundamental Slavic traits with which his own teachings were at war. The seeds of the ailment which was devastating the life of his people were planted in him also, but he at least saw it as an ailment, and instead of sinking under it inertly, gave himself up to discovering and applying the remedy. Western ideals of conduct and positive western culture offered him the escape from the stagnant morasses of Slavic indifferentism and supplied the motive power for his principal stories.

In the heart of Turgenev there lurks a cosmic sadness, born, it may be, of the spirit that broods over the vast desolate steppes of his native land and shedding its melancholy light over his whole universe. Nature appears to him insensible and the fate of man in the world evil. A thin partition separates him from despair or even pessimism. In moments of spiritual crisis this despair wells up from the depths with lyric intensity. He gives it body in some of his fantastic tales, where it is joined with those vague mystic longings for the unreachable which accentuate the earthly weakness and confinement of man. The hero of Phantoms is overcome with sadness and aversion as he views the whole terrestrial globe with its inhabitants—transitory, impotent, crushed by want, by sorrows, by diseases, fettered to a clod of contemptible earth, carrying on an amusing struggle with the unchangeable and the inevitable. It breaks out also under stress of personal disappointment and it becomes poignantly articulate in the Prose Poems of his old age, in which the effort to sustain a courageous heart in the face of an overwhelming sense of loneliness and disillusionment is pathetically weak. This melancholy sensibility gives the key to the novelist's ethical outlook.

Contemplating men in their strivings with one another and in their struggle with an inexorable destiny, Turgenev arrives at the same ethical solution as Carlyle or George Eliot. The great error of men, he often tells us, is that they search for personal happiness when life offers neither the right nor possibility of such happiness. In Russia one was likely to feel this with greater power than elsewhere. There human nature manifested itself with less of conscious dignity, less confidence in its will, less mastery over circumstance. The potential energies of life flickered out in vain dreaming and fruitless aspiration or wasted away in mean, degrading action. One of the characters speaks for many in describing the bitterness of a life that has been lived clumsily and vulgarly. On all hands one finds sickly self-absorption, uneasy thought, impotent gesticulation. What is lacking is simple self-forgetfulness, steadfast conviction, faith in some impersonal idea which has the power of uniting men, be it fatherland, science, liberty, or justice. Instead of the individual self, society with its immutable laws ought to be the corner-stone of existence. The lot of man is not enjoyment but heavy toil, not self-indulgence but renunciation, not the attainment of cherished ideas but the fulfilment of duty. The sentence that completely expresses the noble sadness of Turgenev's moral creed is that "not happiness but human dignity is the chief goal of life."

In an utterance which became famous in Russia, Turgenev analyzed the weakness of character from which its society suffered and at the same time created the symbol by which that weakness has since then been identified. Incidentally he has added a penetrating judgment on two great literary creations, Hamlet and Don Quixote. In these two perennially fascinating figures Turgenev finds the incarnation of the two basic forces on which all life depends, the two fundamental and antithetical qualities of human nature. In Hamlet, Turgenev, like Goethe, sees the paralysis of a will through too much reflection. But further than that he views in Hamlet the spirit of analysis and egoism, the skeptic perpetually concerned with the state of his own emotions and relating everything to himself, the man who cannot forget himself in the execution of a solemn duty nor give himself up unreflectingly to love. Having no faith and no love, persons like Hamlet are incapable of finding anything or contriving anything. They may be delightful companions and leave agreeable traces of their personality, but for society at large they are sterile and useless. Don Quixote, on the other hand, is carried away by faith in an ideal—never mind that it is a comic delusion—for which he is prepared to make the utmost sacrifice. He is without a trace of egoism or self-interest, he never questions the rightness or righteousness of his course but knows his mission in life and pursues it with unwavering singleness of purpose. He is an enthusiast, the servant of an idea, a genuine moral hero. There is no room here for the many details with which the contrast between the two figures is illuminated; what interests us is the opposition of the self-conscious, reflective, but egoistic and practically inert Prince of Denmark to the simple-hearted and narrow-minded but selfless and energetic champion of La Mancha. The former is made to stand for the principle of self-preservation, for the conservative force in society, while the latter represents the creating, moving, progressive principle in life. One easily understands why Turgenev is partial to Don Quixote even while he sympathizes with Hamlet. Of tiny, futile replicas of Hamlet his country knew, alas, too many, whereas what it needed was men with sincerity and conviction like Don Quixote's, who were prepared to arm themselves and fight, leaving the consequences to fate.

The Don Quixotes appear only occasionally in the novels, and then in subordinate roles. They are the unbalanced, fanatical revolutionists like Markelov and Ostrodumov in

[1] Constance Garnett's translation of Turgenev's novels and tales has just been reissued by the Macmillan Company (15 vols.).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Virgin Soil," with their chimerical ideals and their ill-grounded faiths, attaining dignity by the intensity and completeness of their self-devotion. But the Hamlets meet us at every turn. They emerge under every possible aspect, in every condition of social existence, in every conceivable situation. They are the men who consume their own vitals and profit nobody; they are the "superfluous men." They have the faculty of dreaming fine and lofty thoughts and of expressing them eloquently, but they do not believe in their own imaginings and are utterly without the will for carrying them into action. Above all they are unstable, drifting as aimlessly as the "smoke" which Litvinov watches from his moving train. What redeems them is a capacity for suffering, the agonizing sense which at last overpowers them of their failure and futility. They remind one of Coleridge and his

> Sense of past youth, and manhood come in vain,
> And genius given and knowledge won in vain.

Such is Rudin, whose gifts and good intentions are dissipated in empty words and end in utter heartbreak. In a crisis which calls for resolution these men betray their lack of fiber; they simply break down. While an enthusiast like Markelov dies tragically at the hands of the peasants whom he tries to liberate and never feels the bitterness of disillusionment, poor Nezhdanov is crushed, not because his message is repulsed, but because he discovers that he does not believe in his own mission; feeling himself stripped of self-respect and spiritually empty, he becomes a pathetic suicide. The hero of "A Nobleman's Nest," Lavretzky, also bears in himself the seeds of this disease, but he has sufficient moral strength to survive an intense emotional crisis and be purged. In him Turgenev shows the way of redemption through forgetfulness of selfish aims and personal happiness and absorption in beneficent activity, which in Russia means practical work on the land for improving the material lot of the peasant. The hero of "Smoke" ultimately enters the same haven as Lavretzky.

But neither Litvinov nor Lavretzky satisfied their creator's idea of the character needed to bring Russia into line with modern civilization. Their natures are too precarious, their survival depends on a large element of chance. A somewhat different turn of the current and they might be swept away into the sea of passion and drift to their ruin like Sanin in "Spring Freshets." They are, in the end, souls that have been saved. Looking around for a more reliable base on which to build a structure, Turgenev came upon the type of Solomin, whom he regarded as his principal character in "Virgin Soil." Solomin is set apart from the Hamlets in that he is a man with an ideal and without phrases. In common with the Don Quixotes he possesses steadfastness of purpose; for the rest, he can distinguish very well between giants and windmills. Sanity of vision and equilibrium are, in fact, his most hopeful attributes. He is no sudden healer of universal wounds, but a healthy, sensible, splendid worker. His roots go down deep into the common soil; he draws his life from the "strong, gray, monotoned people of the masses" and his heart beats in unison with them. What troubles a reader about this person is that he is not alive. He is only a projection of the writer's ethical and social conscience, a purely intellectual conception. It is not so with Bazarov in "Fathers and Sons," who may be looked upon as representing the negative aspect of the forces that appear in Solomin. The forces are the same, but they are seen actually at work. Here is a grim, pitiless, half-savage nature, with a suggestion of enormous power, disregardful of common sentiments, riding rough-shod over conventional values, a creature of merciless intelligence and violent passions finding no work for his energies save that of destruction. The portrait wounded the younger generation; they thought that Turgenev was satirizing their ideals. But the writer himself well knew that he had never been truer to his artistic conscience than in drawing this character. If there is an indictment conveyed in it, it is an indictment against the state of affairs which provided no wholesome outlet for the Bazarovs. Bazarov is the truest and most significant creation of Turgenev's genius, symbolizing by his tragic existence the melancholy stagnation of his period and conveying at the same time through the impression of his demonic force a hope for the time when the doors of his prison should be thrown open. Is it not Bazarov who has been frightening orderly people in the last few years? Is it not, perhaps, he who is creating the conditions which will make it possible for the Solomins as well as the Lavretzky's to perform the tasks which they have at heart? We are now in a better position to perceive why the tender-hearted but deeply-seeing poet sympathized with this wild creature of his imagination, and against the abuse of his erstwhile admirers maintained the truth and reality of his conception.

The case of Bazarov is not the only one in which readers have disagreed either with the writer or among themselves in interpreting his characters. In the light of some of the lyrical stories and of the lecture on Hamlet and Don Quixote, it is not surprising that this should have happened. In Turgenev's mind there was inherent a conflict between a temperament which controlled his sympathies, and a moral intelligence which dictated his judgments. He could not help feeling for his weak Hamlets at the moment that he condemned them, and he often failed to arouse the reader's enthusiasm in behalf of those level-headed, industrious persons in whom he might be able to see the salvation of Russia but who, after all, awakened no personal response in his own heart. What indeed could there be in common between his poetically sensitive nature and the mere man of action? That is why the Bulgarian Insarov in "On the Eve" is so palpably a failure, as from a certain point of view Solomin is also. Sincere artist though he was, Turgenev could not in the Russia of his day conscientiously avoid the social thesis, and his art at times paid the penalty. In "Fathers and Sons" inspiration triumphed and resulted in a character which fascinates us by his emotional as well as his moral force, even though we do not approve of his actions. Where Turgenev's spirit moved most congenially and harmoniously was among his heroines, beings of fine intelligence and ideal passion, capable of unlimited devotion and far too pure and noble for the men they are matched with. Only among the women of George Meredith can their parallel be found. But that is another story.

Contributors to This Issue

FELIX MORLEY, an American student, frequently reviews English affairs for *The Nation*.

WALTER NELLES, formerly connected with the Civil Liberties Bureau, is a practicing attorney in New York.

JACOB ZEITLIN, a Russian-American, is assistant professor of English in the University of Illinois.

LILY WINNER is a writer for various publications.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Émigrés

By LILY WINNER

WHY has America the "melting-pot" failed to Americanize? Why is Congress, in its hysterical weather-vane fashion, passing bills to restrict immigration when, by casual inquiry, it could ascertain that the margin between immigrants and emigrants, between arrivals of new people and departure of old, is so slight as not to fill the hearts of employing capital with boundless joy? Certain it is that industry is driving against high wages, and doubly certain it is that an unrestricted flow of immigrants will be the most powerful lever to force down the wages of the American worker. Perhaps this knowledge is not confined to our middle class and it may, partially, explain the exodus from America of the thousands returning to Europe in the face of bolshevism, famine, and disease.

Traveling to Holland in the steerage of a large liner, I learned that the émigrés from America are not leaving these shores with the homesick song of a Byron in their hearts. It is not "My adopted land, good-bye!" They are going back in the face of revolution and possible hunger because America has failed in the promise of her traditions. Our country resents the "foreigner." It is not a land of refuge, of homes and comfort, but a battlefield where the dollar is the prize and enough dollars buy return tickets to Eastern and Western Europe, and—farms there. Has it not deprived those who were ever strangers within its gates even of their mother tongue?

It had rained all day, so that the only place the steerage passengers had to sit about, unless they wished to go to sleep in their crowded, rat-ridden bunks, was the dining-hall, and here I listened for hours to many strange stories about America; stories of unfriendliness and prejudice, of struggle and sorrow and disappointment. I will outline briefly a few histories to give an idea why every ship going to Europe is laden with American émigrés.

Mr. and Mrs. J. and three children—Both worked in the great cereal mills of a Western State; had worked there for four years prior to a strike two years ago. After the strike neither of them could get employment because of the employers' blacklist. Came East with their family and secured work, the man in the shipyards and the woman as a domestic, and because of high war wages succeeded in saving between them a thousand dollars. Five hundred of this they sent to a brother in Poland, who bought a large farm and house for them, and the family is now on its way to its future home. Until the war these people, both working most of the time, earned barely enough to get along with in the meanest circumstances.

Mr. and Mrs. K. and four children—Owned a small dairy farm near New York, but never earned more than enough to live on economically until the war, when a new canned-milk plant was built near them. They too saved enough during the four years of the war to buy a small farm in Rumania. Glad to leave America where they had always "to work so hard for only enough to eat and wear" and despite their twenty years' residence here were never accepted as anything but foreigners.

Mr. and Mrs. H. (shoemaker)—Lived for seventeen years in one room in the rear of a tiny, smelly shop and because of the war found their neighbors so unfriendly that now they can return to Germany they are doing so, with their modest savings which relatives have written will buy them a two-family house.

Mr. and Mrs. R. (young couple with three children)—Going back to Poland after ten years in America because they do not want their children to grow up extravagant, saucy, restless, and ungrateful. The American child is, in their opinion, a child of few virtues and they want to keep their own in the path they themselves trod: obedient, contented, and hardworking. They were both reared on farms in western Poland and have saved enough money during the war by their work in American factories to buy a little farm where they will be independent for the rest of their lives. If they had remained in America they would only have "known hard work and disappointment with no future. It costs too much in America to live."

These histories are typical.

On the last night aboard ship before reaching our destination all the steerage passengers gathered in the dining-hall for a farewell celebration. There were songs and cheers for the friendships that had been made on the trip, for the officers and workers on the ship, for the brave captain who had brought us safely through our voyage, for the fatherlands, for Holland, for Poland, for Russia, for Bohemia, for the ladies and children—cheers and laughter and national hymns—and for America only one phrase, a phrase that brought tears to the eyes of most of them, the phrase "Our sorrows in America."

I felt exasperated. I turned to the well-dressed American who sat next to me, a native Hollander, who was returning to his country to choose a wife because American girls were flighty and extravagant. "Surely," I exclaimed, "the least they could do would be to sing the American national hymn when they are singing every other hymn in the world. They are all going back to the lands of their birth with their pockets lined with American gold. Are they without gratitude for the country that helped them to their coming independence?"

He looked at me in silence for a moment. I could see that he hesitated. Finally, however, he answered me with a smile: "We are not in America, so I am not afraid to be frank with you. I have become an American citizen and I want you to believe that I love America. America has been good to me and I prefer her to any other country in the world. But the American people for the most part are a queer lot. They seem to think that the foreigner who comes to America is the scum of the earth. As a matter of fact most of the immigrants are men and women of the same stamina as the pioneer settlers of America; the native American fails to appreciate the courage, the vision, and the hardihood it requires for these people to uproot their lives and journey with their children and a few household goods to a new country. They come to America full of faith, determined to work hard and to build a future for themselves. America in her turn needs these people. She has had placards all over Europe inviting the worker to her mines and factories. American industries want cheap labor and carry on a continuous propaganda to persuade foreign labor to migrate to them. But America has nothing save work to offer these people on their arrival; no friendly smile, no personal interest, no fellowship. On his arrival in America the worker is immediately faced with the old familiar battle for existence, a battle in which he neither gives nor receives quarter. Because of America's great

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

resources he earns more and fares better than he could in Europe; but he also works harder.

"Here across the table you see a typical case. This man and his wife are returning to Bohemia for a visit to their parents, taking with them their five small children. You and I have frequently been obliged to leave the table in sheer disgust at their table manners. They eat with their fingers and behave like animals. The mother gives the baby everything from cabbage to beer; the children are cruel and vicious. Yet this man and his wife, working in America, have many times during the past four years earned a monthly income of five hundred dollars. They have lived in America twenty years. Why in all that time didn't America civilize them? Why did she not raise their standard of living, give them ideals? The war has made them rich—so rich that out of wages alone they have saved a small fortune that enables them to travel with the entire family to their native home and later return to America, and while they are in Bohemia they intend to buy a small farm for their parents. But spiritually they are as poor as ever.

"You will hear people tell you that America cares nothing for the foreigner except for the hard labor she can get out of him at the lowest wages. This is true. Until Americanism is not only preached to these people, but practiced as well, you will see them saving their money and returning to the lands they came from to end their days in ease."

I looked about the room and saw half a dozen children coming toward me, and as they seemed to hesitate I smiled encouragingly. "We think we ought to sing the Star Spangled Banner," one of them whispered shyly. "But we're not sure of the words. Will you help us sing it?" Although I was born in America, I didn't know all the words myself, so we sang the chorus only. There was a polite patter of hands after we had finished.

"The Case for the Miners"

By SIEGFRIED SASSOON

Something goes wrong with my synthetic brain
When I defend the Strikers and explain
My reasons for not blackguarding the Miners.
"What do you know?" exclaim my fellow-diners
(Peeling their plovers' eggs or lifting glasses
Of mellowed *Château Rentier* from the table),
"What do you know about the working classes?"

I strive to hold my own; but I'm unable
To state the case succinctly. Indistinctly
I mumble about World-Emancipation,
Standards of Living, Nationalization
Of Industry; until they get me tangled
In superficial details; goad me on
To unconvincing vagueness. When we've wrangled
From soup to savory, my temper's gone.

"Why should a miner earn six pounds a week?"
"Leisure! They'd only spend it in a bar!"
"Standard of life! You'll never teach them Greek!"
"Or make them more contented than they are!"
That's how my port-flushed friends discuss the Strike.
And that's the reason why I shout and splutter.
And that's the reason why I'd almost like
To see them hawking matches in the gutter.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter-in-Search-of-Amusement is at times a pathetic figure. Having an exceedingly thin purse and a taste for the movies which becomes jaded after one or two trips a month, he is frequently thrown back on one of the most unpretentious and inexpensive forms of entertainment, involving, as it does, only a loss of shoe-leather. To be explicit, the Drifter walks. The other day he paid a visit to his friend Mrs. Wolinsky, who queens it over one of the brass-shops under the elevated railway downtown on Allen Street. He found her surrounded as usual by a thousand brass candle-sticks and several hundred copper, brass, and pewter bowls and jugs and pitchers and pans of every conceivable shape and degree of polish, ranging from a massive old tea-kettle big enough to hold a good-sized baby, which Mrs. Wolinsky swears was used for her great-grandfather's tea in Russia (this is, of course, as it may be), to a tiny mug of ancient brass no bigger than a thimble. If you liken it to a thimble, by the way, it will be described by Mrs. W. as the very mug whence her great-grandmother sipped her tea, using it as a thimble between times (which, again, the Drifter does not doubt except in his blacker and more skeptical moods).

* * * * *

ON this particular day Mrs. Wolinsky was entertaining a not uncomely young woman who was buying brass candlesticks with almost vulgar abandon and listening most eagerly, it seemed, to the flood of discourse that was directed at her. The Drifter would not attempt to reproduce in writing the inimitable and exquisite mixture of Yiddish, Russian, and New Yorkese, combined with a lisp, with which Mrs. Wolinsky speaks. It is gentle, voluble, and gesticulatory, accompanied by a wide and generous smile and frequent pats on her listener's arm or shoulder. "Dear," she was saying (although the Drifter was sure she had never laid eyes on the girl before), "you ain't like some girls that comes in here and act haughty and like they didn't like the Jewish people. Dear, I hope you come back soon with a nice young fella and buy things for your house." At this moment her eyes lit on the Drifter and brightened with recognition. "See here," she said, to his extreme embarrassment, "how about him? You should get you a young fella like he is and come see me soon again!" The Drifter made his exit hastily and not with dignity.

* * * * *

THE Drifter has received the following letter signed L. K.:

If you haven't drifted around Toronto recently, let me call to your attention some of the elevating propaganda on the billboards of that city, where the fight for the possession of poor, repressed Ontario waxes hot:

THE TURKS ARE PROHIBITIONISTS. DO YOU
WANT TO BE A TURK? THEN VOTE
FOR PROHIBITION.
LENIN AND TROTZKY ARE PROHIBITIONISTS.
DO YOU WANT TO BE A BOLSHEVIK?
THEN VOTE FOR PROHIBITION.

Out on the billboards on the main street in clear day. Honest. And do you know I kept watching the Canadians walking by and reading them—and on King Street nobody even laughed. The signs of the opposition party are just as enlightening.

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

The Railroad Problem

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just received copy of *The Nation* of April 20 which contains my letter of March 29 concerning the general railroad situation.

I regret to say that I read with some disappointment the comments that were made by the Editor of *The Nation* concerning the subject matter of the letter above referred to. For instance, while admitting that the railroads last year carried "the heaviest traffic in their history," the Editor intimates that the mere fact that the railroads called on the Interstate Commerce Commission for its support in that connection, as provided by the Esch-Cummins Act, would indicate a failure of the law. On the contrary, what actually took place was the very best possible test that could have been had of the efficacy of the law. Congress recognized that emergencies would, undoubtedly, arise when the amount of business offered would be more than the railroads could carry, and it gave to its agent, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the right to exercise very broad authority under such circumstances, which it had never been permitted to exercise before. In short, it authorized its agent, in times of emergency, to direct the use and movement of all the cars and engines of all the railroads, regardless of ownership, in such a way as would best serve the requirements of the public for transportation. Manifestly, the right to exercise such power ought not and could not be granted to the individual companies themselves, but must be exercised by a proper agency of Congress; in fact, by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I must confess that I am quite unable to understand the Editor's point of view as expressed in the paragraph to which I have referred.

One other thing. The following words appear in the same article:

"Apparently, Mr. Willard believes that so long as some trains move, the law has been a success in regard to labor relations. But does he really think that the labor problem on the roads is in a fair way to settlement? If so, we earnestly suggest that he try to find out the temper of the men on his own lines."

Replying to the above question, first, I certainly do believe that the labor problem on the railroads is in a fair way to a settlement; and second, I also believe that I understand the temper generally of the men in the employ of the Baltimore & Ohio Company, and in my opinion it is not such as the Editor's comment would imply. However, if you care to go into the matter further, and I hope you do, I suggest that you make inquiries regarding the matter of the Honorable William J. Burke, member of the present Congress, from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Mr. Burke for many years was a conductor in the service of the Baltimore & Ohio Company. He is now the General Chairman, elected by all of the conductors in the Baltimore & Ohio service. He is also a member of Congress and is living in Washington where he is easily accessible. I would be glad if you would inquire of Mr. Burke concerning the temper, the loyalty, and the general disposition of Baltimore & Ohio employees at the present time as he understands the situation. I have not seen Mr. Burke personally for more than a year, and I have had no correspondence with him in the meantime. I believe, however, that he is in position to know and understand conditions on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, and I am quite willing to accept whatever he may say in this connection. I earnestly hope you will endeavor to get from Mr. Burke an expression of his views concerning the subject.

Of course, if the Editor of *The Nation* is definitely convinced, as he says he is, of the "complete failure of the law" and is not willing to consider anything that may be said in support of the law by men who are actually engaged in trying to make it a success, then it would seem hardly worth while to continue correspondence or discussion concerning the matter.

Baltimore, April 23 DANIEL WILLARD

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your issue of April 20 contains a letter from Mr. Daniel Willard, president of the B. & O. Railroad, replying to an editorial which under the caption The Railroad Wreck contains the statement that "today the Esch-Cummins law is a complete failure." Under Mr. Willard's letter—who ably discusses causes for existing conditions to disprove your editorial's assertions—is an editor's note which contains the following: "We repeat that the failure of the law is complete. It was based on an unsound theory, and even Mr. Warfield's association of security owners admits the failure. If this were not the case Senator Cummins would not himself be demanding a rigid inquiry into the whole railroad situation. Mr. Warfield himself is proposing an incredibly complicated machinery—some fifty boards—to put efficiency into the railroad system."

It is not my purpose to enter into controversy in respect to the Esch-Cummins Act. My reason for this communication is solely to correct the statement made that "even Mr. Warfield's association of security owners admits the failure." Permit me to say that there has been no such "admission," nor is the act considered a "failure."

Under the unprecedented curtailment of business and drop in prices of commodities hauled by railroads owing to severe after-war readjustments which have been taking place for some time, and equally unprecedented, the Esch-Cummins Act could not—nor could any act dealing with rate levels—be expected to properly function. Questions involving rate levels are highly technical. I will therefore not attempt in this communication to deal with this subject.

The Esch-Cummins Act can hardly be held responsible for the precipitate contraction of credits with the consequent crumbling of commodity prices to a point where any freight rate would seem disproportionate to the selling price obtained for the products transported.

The exhaustion of general credit was manifest before the increase in railroad rates. There had been a progressive decline in the reserve ratio of the Federal Reserve banks from the peak of August, 1917, caused by the expansion of bank credits of over 80 per cent to below 40 per cent in the early part of 1920. The increase in railroad rates did not take effect until September, 1920, when the exhaustion of credit showed its effect on commodity prices. The increase in rates cannot therefore be held accountable for the contraction in business from which the railroads have suffered acutely. There may be specific cases but not so generally.

When presenting to Congress in 1919 certain suggestions in respect to the Transportation Act, the Association of security owners also made proposals to insure intensive economies in railroad operation, car supply, etc. Their adoption would have supplied the means to have largely taken up the slack now constituting railroad losses in revenue, and railroad rates could have been reduced. The statement recently handed to Senator Cummins, to which you refer, contained practically the same provisions for economical railroad operation as were submitted in 1919. We believed then that the provisions suggested were necessary to round out the machinery essential to secure satisfactory results. The present situation demonstrates the soundness of the position then taken.

It will be conclusively shown in due course that our position in this regard, which is now substantially what our position was in 1919, is correct. Permit me to suggest, therefore, that you should not assume that our action in recurring to our original recommendation is an admission that the Transportation Act is, as you say, a failure. Your designation of our original proposal in its present form as "incredibly complicated machinery" is another assumption, as we hope to show in due time.

Baltimore, Md., April 28 S. DAVIES WARFIELD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

Clio: Maid of All Work

Studies in Statecraft. By Sir Geoffrey Butler. Cambridge University Press.

Ireland in the European System. By James Hogan. Vol. I, 1500-1557. Longmans, Green and Company.

The Evolution of Revolution. By H. M. Hyndman. Boni and Liveright.

BERNARD SHAW'S epigram, "that we learn from history that no man ever learned anything from history," implies that men have at least turned to Clio for instruction. Truer, perhaps, to say that they have turned to her for corroboration of their own theories; they have made her not so much a teacher as a servant. From antiquity she has nursed our children with her tales of wonder; she has made the bed of the nationalists and the jingoes; she has cooked the pabulum for the economist and sociologist; and she is expected to clean up the messes made by cranks of all sorts.

Even if all this be admitted it must not be taken to cast any slur upon the good faith of many of Clio's patrons who have sought her less for her own sake than for the work she does. Of the three honorably objective studies herewith reviewed, that of Sir Geoffrey Butler is perhaps the most purely historic in spirit. His plan is to find antecedents for the League of Nations and in general for the present designs for world peace, and the outcome of his lucubrations is anything but encouraging. Books of this sort have been fairly numerous of late, but Sir Geoffrey has not been able to use the two most prominent of them, Christian H. Lange's "History of Internationalism" and J. Kvačala's biography of William Postell. The first essay toward establishing world peace that Sir Geoffrey notices was an interesting debate held at Rome in 1468 between Roderic Bishop of Zamora and Bartholomew Platina, the famous historian of the papacy. While the former maintained the advantages of war, and on surprisingly familiar ground, the latter upheld the benefits of peace. The popes were fond of these discussions; a few years later Julius II employed Erasmus to draft arguments on both sides of the same thesis; and the humanist was much chagrined when the Pope decided that the argument for war, which he meant as a mere parody, was better than that for peace, into which he put his whole soul.

The next plans for universal peace were French. William Postell advocated both elective monarchy and a *pax Gallicana*, resting on the might of French arms. Perhaps it was he who suggested to Crucé and Sully the Grand Design for a world federation of which so much has been made lately. It is now thought that this plan, attributed by Sully to Henry IV, was in reality excogitated by the minister himself long after the death of his master. Its essence consisted of reducing the European balance of power to an equilibrium, and it doubtless got much of its attraction to France from the fact that it took the form of an anti-Hapsburg league. Sully's statement that he talked over the design with Elizabeth and James I has been generally discredited, but a friendly letter from James to Henry IV, dated 1597, recently published by the writer of this review, shows that there were really negotiations for an alliance between the two monarchs.

While Cork is engaged in a tragic and heroic struggle, making her the peer of Jerusalem and of La Rochelle and of Louvain, she produces important intellectual work. From her university George Boole half a century ago sent forth his famous studies of mathematics and logic. And now, in Professor James Hogan, she has found a historian of no small merit. With thoroughness he has studied the annals of his country, with art and really wonderful fairness and calm he has set forth the results of his researches in the endeavor to put Ireland into its proper European relationships. Taking exception to H. G. Wells's statement that "Ireland as a significant land did not enter the stage of European history till the nineteenth century," he labors to prove the international importance of the western isle in the first half of the sixteenth century. The policy of the Irish to resist the English conquest was made harder at that time by two new factors in history, the Reformation and the economic revolution. While differences of creed added mutual animosity to the racial antagonism of the two peoples, the new English merchant class began greedily to exploit the subject land and to compress her commerce and industry. This made Ireland the natural ally of England's enemies, Spain and France, and most people will be surprised to learn how ever present were the Irish leaders at the courts of Paris and Madrid. Indeed, wherever the intrigue was thickest there were the sons of Erin. The last place in the world one would expect to find them was Wittenberg, and yet the sources show that just as Thomas Cromwell's agents were investing that capital of Protestantism, in the years 1534-36, two Irishmen, John Duncan and Roderic Hector, were there to represent the interests of their race.

Mr. Hyndman is first a Socialist and then a historian. One may look to his account of the recent labor movement in which he took part for some light and may value his shrewd observations on the probable failure of the general strike, and on the tyranny of the Bolsheviks, or his prophecy of a labor government in the near future in England. But it is hopeless to look to his pages for any light on the past. Not only does he use few and poor sources, but his bias is such against the possessing class in history that he can hardly find a good word to say for any famous character that ever lived. The result is to give his style a sneering cynicism that outdoes the followers of Machiavelli. Guicciardini at least left the reader uncertain whether Savonarola was a prophet or an astute impostor, but Mr. Hyndman has no such doubts about Cromwell, who is to him nothing but a self-seeking hypocrite and assassin from the beginning to the end of his career. The humane Cicero is taunted bitterly for "advocating diabolical cruelty to slaves" and for various imaginary crimes such as strangling Catiline in prison with his own hands. Brutus was a "ferocious aristocratic usurer and hirer of cutthroats." History to Mr. Hyndman is a Donnybrook Fair—when he sees a head he hits it.

PRESERVED SMITH

The Seven Stories

The Golden Windmill and Other Stories. By Stacy Aumonier. The Macmillan Company.

Original Sinners. By Henry W. Nevinson. B. W. Huebsch, Inc.

People. By Pierre Hamp. Authorized Translation by James Whitall. Harcourt, Brace and Company.

"THE Arabs have stated," Mr. Stacy Aumonier quotes approvingly, "that there are only seven stories in the world." So dramatic critics of a well-known variety echo: "There are only seven dramatic situations in the world." A distinguished raconteur once reduced these situations to five: They marry. He marries someone else. She marries someone else. He dies. She dies. All these sayings leave out the fact that there are significant varieties of human feeling and even reasoning, that people submit, rebel, and even reach a point at which they are, at least subjectively, a little more than pawns upon the board of the conventional life of human society. In a game there are only so many moves. And no one thinks of extending the number of moves or breaking the rules of the game, because no one is compelled to play. But participation in life is compulsory. So soon, therefore, as people begin in any true sense to reflect, they come into conflict with each other not only in the course of the prescribed moves; they come into conflict with the rules themselves, with those who think themselves the masters of the game, with pieties within them that cling to the old calculable moves, with inner necessities that demand a new set altogether. When that happens the seven traditional

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

situations become seven thousand and the restricted game melts into the boundless universe.

Mr. Stacy Aumonier sticks strictly to the game and to a tacit recognition of all its rules. Hence nothing is left him except violence of circumstance and arrangements of action into meretricious contrasts like the members of a false and labored antithesis. He plans very carefully for a jolt of surprise like a chess-player planning far ahead a brilliant and unexpected move. He exacts a weary admiration for his dexterity but succeeds in telling us nothing that is new or true or vital. His old amazing contact with the concrete earth is gone. His surfaces are now of a pink silk smoothness. His art has become craftsmanship.

The philosophic mind and the creative imagination invent their technical processes as they go along and invent them from within. It is safe to assert that Mr. Henry W. Nevinson did not concern himself greatly with the technique of the short story. What came to him were sudden, deep perceptions, electric flashes of insight into the soul of man and into the character of civilization. Each built its own visible form. He can be as ingenious as anyone. But his ingenuity, as in the story Sitting at a Play, serves to illustrate an idea of great intricacy and importance. A man's subjective vision gives him a sincere and not ignoble justification for actions that the most flexible external judgment cannot but condemn. Where does the truth lie? The other stories are austerer in form even when there is a touch of humor in the idea or the observations involved. They are admirably calculated to discredit the common notion that art has nothing to do with thought. In the deeper sense every fine story, poem, play has at its core an idea or the illustration of an idea which the author desires not only to communicate, but to communicate persuasively. The presence of such an idea is precisely what differentiates art from empty craftsmanship and Mr. Nevinson's stories from this group of Mr. Aumonier's. Thus Sly's Awakening deals with the old notion of life as a dream, and Pongo's Illusion with the shameless cruelty of conquest. The Act of Fear works out with quiet but superb forcefulness the corrupting and destructive consequences of inhuman moral taboos. In Diocletian's Day is a timeless comment, richly beautiful in imaginative execution, upon the enduring spiritual imbecility of the State. Diocletian is no common politician; he is a gentleman, a man of peace, a lover of beauty. But tolerance must stop somewhere. His stops at the Christians. "That youth," he remarks, as the lions rip their victim's throat, "that youth refused the military oath because his superstition commanded its followers not to bind themselves by swearing nor to resist evil. . . . These pitiful wretches enjoy the peace and splendor of Rome but will not move a finger to protect or extend either."

M. Pierre Hamp, a man of strong creative gifts who has risen from the actual ranks of labor, repudiates, with a touch of fierceness, art as it is commonly understood. He has seen so much crude suffering that to create beauty for its own sake seems to him an affront to mankind. Very well. But he is eager to restrict the subject matter of literature and forgets that the complications and sufferings of the strictly personal life involve man's meaning and destiny quite as much, if indeed not far more, than the problems and processes of labor, and that the achievement of a freer and more humane existence by the masses will only serve vastly to increase the numbers of those who will be concerned with the subtleties he now condemns. His own stories are far from artless, nor is their art conceivable without the tradition of the modern French "conte" from Maupassant on. He takes a sharply seen and tenaciously remembered character—a working-girl, a pastry-cook, a skinflint shop-keeper. He defines that character through very concrete bits of action and passion and ends upon a note of bitter and laconic irony. Thus he quietly shapes each story into an accusation of the economic order which is the more devastating because he has given his proletarians no fancied virtues and no graces but those of their sheer humanness. His portraits are deep-etched and memorable and an excellent translation keeps his descriptions from being relaxed or blunted. But he is no Gorki. He and his people have a Latin hardness and definiteness. There is no brooding, no inflowing of the universal, no hint of any pain deeper than the lack of bread and light.

Notable New Books

Russia in the Eighties. By John F. Baddeley. Longmans, Green.

A special correspondent's recollections of sport and politics under the old regime.

A Selection from the Poems of Giosuè Carducci. Translated and Annotated with a Biographical Introduction by Emily A. Tribe. Longmans, Green.

A handsome introduction to this most admirable of Italy's nineteenth-century poets.

Discipline and the Derelict. By Thomas Arkle Clark. Macmillan.

Kindly studies of the mental, moral, and spiritual processes of undergraduates as observed by an experienced dean of men.

Women in the Life of Balzac. By Juanita Helm Floyd. Holt.

A meticulous study, without much humor, of Balzac's relations with women, including his "literary," "business and social," and "sentimental" friends, and of the influence of women upon his work.

Histoire du Canada. Par F. X. Garneau. Revue et annotée par Hector Garneau. Tome II. Cinquième édition. Paris: Félix Alcan.

A definitive edition of what is still the standard history of Canada to about 1840, first published in 1845-1852. The first volume has already appeared in a sixth edition. The revision, the work of the author's grandson, comprises extensive footnotes and brief appendices which correct or supplement the text and sweep the field of Canadian bibliography.

The Senate and Treaties, 1789-1817. By Ralston Hayden. Macmillan.

A detailed historical study of "the development of the treaty-making functions of the United States Senate during their formative period."

The Yorkshire Woollen and Worsted Industries. By Herbert Heaton. Oxford.

An erudite monograph of value to general readers interested in the history of industry.

Early History of Singing. By W. J. Henderson. Longmans, Green.

A clear and careful account of methods of singing from the beginning of the Christian era to the time of Alessandro Scarlatti.

Japan and the California Problem. By T. Iyenaga and Kenoske Sato. Putnam.

The Japanese problem usefully discussed from the point of view of Japanese observers who have lived in the United States.

The Community Capitol. By M. Clyde Kelly. Pittsburgh: Mayflower Press.

A study of the uses to which schoolhouses may be put in their communities and a plea for the development of wider uses.

Serbia and Europe. Edited by L. Marcovitch. Macmillan.

Numerous articles by Serbian publicists setting forth the Serbian position and defending the Serbian policy during the war.

The Sonnets of Milton. With Introduction and Notes. By John S. Smart. Glasgow: Maclehose, Jackson.

A useful edition with particularly extended commentary on sources and characteristics.

Collected Poems. With Autobiographical and Critical Fragments. By Frederic W. H. Myers. Macmillan.

A complete collection of the very ordinary verses left by this famous scholar and occultist.

Principles of Government Accounting and Reporting. By Francis Oakey. Appleton.

An important volume in the series called Principles of Administration and published by the Institute for Government Research. It analyzes the forms of records kept and statements rendered in various States and municipalities in the United States, and proposes other forms devised by the author.

The Life and Times of Sir Alexander Tilloch Galt. By Oscar Douglas Skelton. Oxford.

The life of Galt against a background of Canadian politics.

The Jew and American Ideals. By John Spargo. Harper.

What the author calls "a defense of American ideals and institutions against anti-Semitism; a plea for Christian civilization."

The Myth of the Jewish Menace in World Affairs. By Lucien Wolf. Macmillan.

An admirable elucidation and refutation of the preposterous charges based upon the "Protocols of the Elders of Zion." Published at a very low price, it deserves the widest circulation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Turnpikes of New England. By Frederic J. Wood. Marshall Jones.

An admirable piece of antiquarian and topographical work, undertaken with enthusiasm, carried out with conscience, and printed and illustrated with distinction.

Drama

Revivals

THE notion that every play presented must be a new play is confined to the American theater. The managers who do not depend wholly on factory production are constantly in a hectic state. Blind and confused they continue to demand new plays and forget that the most fertile periods of dramatic literature could not have satisfied their needs. For a normal season brings one hundred and fifty openings to New York. Deduct one-third—a very liberal allowance—for musical comedies, "revues," and miscellaneous entertainments, and there remain one hundred productions distinctly dramatic in character. The inevitable result is that the great majority of plays are literally beneath contempt and find a quick way to deserved oblivion.

One thing alone can cure this condition. It must be understood that sound drama is more permanent than millinery, that a play worth presenting at all has not spent its life at the end of its first "run." Thus all the Theater Guild successes, except "Heartbreak House," have been revivals: "John Ferguson," "Jane Clegg," "The Power of Darkness," "Liliom." Thus, too, Mr. Arthur Hopkins succeeded with "Redemption" and Mr. John D. Williams with "The Letter of the Law," and playgoers traveled week after week to Grand Street to see Galsworthy's "The Mob." Commercial managers, observing these facts superficially but without any insight into their true character, have bethought them of reviving plays. But they have not revived good plays, only plays that were once profitable—Hartley Manners's "Peg o' My Heart" and Edward Sheldon's "Romance." These plays are precisely like millinery, dusty and grotesque as last year's bonnets. Art alone has a freshness that does not perish with the year. Such revivals reveal more glaringly the poverty of our stage. They neither nourish the artistic sense of our audiences nor do they help the alarming number of excellent actors and actresses who are kept in idleness by the lack of appropriate parts. In those periods of idleness the artists of our stage, quite like the managers, wander about with a vague and pathetically trustful eagerness. When they come upon a critic they look at him reproachfully because he does not hide a new dramatic literature under his coat.

The critic cannot, unfortunately, produce dramatists to order. But a moderate acquaintance with dramatic literature and the ways of the theater in other countries often causes him to ponder productions that would keep our stage busy in a truly civilized fashion for at least a season. He is shy about making his suggestions. He knows so well how they will be met. And he is weary of the old phrases because he is convinced that the public taste is artificially kept at an abnormally low level, and because he regards business reasons as no reasons at all. It is not necessary for managers to be rich or for "stars" to draw higher salaries than a great surgeon or a great teacher. So, unwilling to battle with a stupid and greedy world, he arranges for a season on the theater of his own mind.

Mr. John Barrymore begins that season by playing Osvald in "Ghosts." He then proceeds to play the leper prince in Hauptmann's "Henry of Auë," the role for which all his experiments have been but as an unconscious preparation. Here he is as beautiful as he pleases, as stricken as he pleases, and as eloquent in the delivery of verse as he was in Richard III.

Next, Miss Grace George opens at The Playhouse as Millamant in "The Way of the World." If Congreve proves too harsh and brilliant, she changes to Lady Teazle in "The School for Scandal" and helps to revive the great tradition of British comedy that is almost dead. She may fail, but she need not disappear. For in this ideal season she plays not pinchbeck imitations of the real thing, but that thing itself, which is "La Parisienne" by Henri Becque.

At the same time Miss Ethel Barrymore plays "Candida," Miss Florence Reed "Iris," Miss Pauline Lord "The Second Mrs. Tanqueray"—not every revival need be a masterpiece—and Miss Emily Stevens first "Hedda Gabler" and then Rita Allmers in "Little Eyolf," taking good care to have Miss Beryl Mercer cast for the part of the old rat-wife, while around the corner there is an "all-star" production of Jules Lemaître's "The Pardon." Richard Bennett is Georges, Miss Estelle Winwood, Suzanne; and Miss Mary Nash, Thérèse. A softer and more poetical glow, a deeper atmosphere, is needed. And so Miss Alice Brady opens as Christine in Schnitzler's "Light o' Love" and Mr. Arnold Daly and Mr. Joseph Schildkraut play, and play incomparably, the father and son in Hauptmann's "Michael Kramer."

The season goes on and Mr. Ben Ami appears as Hjalmar Ekdahl in "The Wild Duck," with Miss Lord as Gina and Miss Helen Hayes or Miss Genevieve Tobin as Hedvig; Mr. Leo Ditrichstein plays General Sibéran in Hervieu's "Know Thyself"; and Mr. Whitford Kane gives us, in successive months, ripe and whimsical performances of the "Bourgeois Gentilhomme," the village justice Adam in Kleist's "The Broken Jug," and Wellwyn in Galsworthy's "The Pigeon."

Shakespeare is not forgotten in that annus mirabilis of the critic's vision. Two of his plays, both with scenery by Mr. Robert Edmond Jones in his second manner, not his third, run from September to June. One is "The Merchant of Venice" with Mr. Barney Bernard as Shylock, the other is "Othello" with Mr. Charles Gilpin in the title role and Mr. George Arliss as Iago. Finally there comes a crowning splendor. The greatest English tragedy since the seventeenth century has its American première. Margaret Anglin plays Beatrice in Shelley's "Cenci."

There are new plays by native dramatists in the critic's ideal season. But good plays rather than many. No "Welcome Stranger" while Henri Nathansen's "Behind Walls" has not been seen nor Herman Heijerman's "Ghetto"; no "Challenge" or "Poldekin" while Hartleben's "Hanna Jagert" is unknown. There is a play by Susan Glaspell on Broadway and one by Eugene O'Neill, and every authentic talent is given the chance and the experience of a production. But the season never grows dull. For if it threatens to do so, someone quickly produces Strindberg's "Comrades" or Brieux's "The May-Beetles" or Shaw's "You Never Can Tell" (with Mr. Grant Mitchell as the dentist, of course) or even Elizabeth Baker's admirable and half-forgotten "Chains."

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Now Ready
"The Next War" By WILL IRWIN
Published by E. P. DUTTON & CO. Price, $1.50

A Timely Book
Taxation in the New State
by
J. A. Hobson
$1.49
R. H. Macy & Co. Inc.
Herald Square New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

The Russian-Polish Treaty

THE Russian-Polish Treaty was signed by the representatives of Russia, Poland, and the Ukraine at Riga, March 18, 1921. It was ratified by the Russian Soviet Government on March 22, and by the Polish Diet on April 15. The most important articles of the treaty are given in full below with proper indication of the nature of the articles or parts of articles omitted.

Introduction

Poland on the one hand and Russia and the Ukraine on the other hand, desirous of terminating as soon as possible the war between them, and with the aim of concluding a final, lasting, and honorable peace founded on a mutual understanding, on the basis of the Agreement signed in Riga on October 12, 1920, concerning the preliminary conditions of peace, decided to open peace negotiations, and to this end designated as their plenipotentiaries:

The Goverment of the Republic of Poland: Messrs. John Dombski, Stanislaw Kauzik, Edward Lechowicz, Henry Strasburger, and Leon Wasilewski.

The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic in its own name, and with the authorization of the Government of the White-Russian Socialist Soviet Republic, and the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic: Messrs. Adolf Joffe, Jacob Hanecki, Emanuel Quiring, Leonide Obolenski, and Alex Szumski.

The above-named plenipotentiaries assembled in Riga, and after the exchange of their credentials, acknowledged as sufficient and drawn up in proper form, agreed to the following decisions:

Article I

Termination of the State of War

Both contracting parties declare that the state of war between them is ended.

Article II

Both contracting parties, conforming to the principle of the right of nations to self-determination, recognize the independence of the Ukraine and White-Russia. . . .

[The greater part of Article II defines the eastern boundary line between Poland on the one hand and the Ukraine and White-Russia on the other.]

Each of the contracting parties undertakes the obligation to withdraw, not later than fourteen days after the signing of the present treaty, its military forces and its administration from those localities which, in the present description of the frontier, have been recognized as belonging to the other side. . . .

Article III

Territorial Rights

Russia and the Ukraine renounce all rights and pretensions to territories situated to the west of the frontier determined in Article II of the present treaty. Poland on her part renounces, to the benefit of the Ukraine and White-Russia, all rights and pretensions to territories situated to the east of this frontier.

Both contracting parties agree that in so far as the territories situated to the west of the present frontier, determined in Article II of the present treaty, include territories under dispute between Poland and Lithuania the question of the appertainance of these territories to the one or the other of these two states belongs exclusively to Poland and Lithuania.

Article IV

Former Appertainance to Russia

From the former appertainance of parts of the territories of the Polish Republic to the former Russian Empire no obligations or burdens result for Poland in relation to Russia, except those foreseen by the present treaty. In an equal measure, from the former common appertainance to the former Russian Empire no mutual obligations and burdens result between Poland, White-Russia, and the Ukraine, except those foreseen by the present treaty.

Article V

Respect of Sovereignty

Both contracting parties guarantee to each other complete respect of state sovereignty and abstinence from any interference whatever in the interior affairs of the other party, especially from agitation, propaganda, and all kinds of intervention, or from supporting the same.

Both contracting parties undertake the obligation not to create and not to support organizations having for aim armed combat with the other contracting party, either attacking its territorial integrity or preparing the overthrow of its state or social structure by violence—as well as organizations assuming the role of government of the other party or of a part of its territory. Wherefore, the two contracting parties undertake the obligation not to allow the presence on their territories of such organizations, their official representations and other organs, to forbid the recruiting of soldiers, as well as the import to their territories and the transport through their territories of armed forces, arms, ammunition, and all kinds of war material destined for these organizations.

Article VI

Option

(1) All persons who have reached the age of 18 years and who are on Polish territory at the moment of the ratification of the present treaty, who on the 1st of August, 1914, were citizens of the Russian Empire and are inscribed, or have the right to be inscribed in the registers of the stable population of the former Kingdom of Poland, or were inscribed in the town or rural communes, or in one of the social class organizations on territories of the former Russian Empire forming part of Poland, have the right to make known their desire on the subject of the option of Russian or Ukrainian citizenship. From former citizens of the former Russian Empire of other categories, who at the moment of the ratification of the present treaty are on Polish territory, such action is not required.

(2) Former citizens of the former Russian Empire who have reached the age of 18 years, who at the moment of the ratification of the present treaty are on the territories of Russia or the Ukraine, and are inscribed or have the right to be inscribed in the registers of the stable population of the former Kingdom of Poland, or were inscribed in town or rural communes, or in one of the social class organizations on territories of the former Russian Empire forming part of Poland, will be considered as Polish citizens if, in the form of option foreseen in the present Article, they express such desire.

Equally, persons who have reached the age of 18 years and are on the territory of Russia or of the Ukraine, will be considered as Polish citizens if, in the form of option foreseen in the present Article, they express such a desire and prove that they descend from participants in the struggle for the independence of Poland in the period from 1830 to 1865, or that they are the descendants of persons who, no further than three generations back, were permanently domiciled on the territory of the former Republic of Poland, and prove that they themselves by their activities, their use of the Polish language as their usual language, and in the bringing-up of their offspring, have plainly manifested attachment to Polish nationality. . . .

(4) The choice of the husband extends to the wife and the children up to the age of 18 years, in so far as a different understanding does not take place between husband and wife on this subject. If husband and wife cannot agree, the wife has the right of independent choice of citizenship; in this case

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"My Chinese Marriage"

She was an American girl—daughter of a family of modest means in a middle-western college town. He was a Chinese—eldest son of a family of gentry for many centuries arbiters of the life of their ancestral town in the pleasant hills of South China. They met at college, fell in love and married. His family disowned him. They went to China to live but far away from his people—where he practised international law. Shortly came their children; later followed reconciliation with his family.

And then this American girl, tremendously in love with her husband, faced the ordeal of life as the daughter-in-law of his Chinese mother.

"M. T. F.", now a young widow, back again in her American home with her three children, is writing the story of how it turned out. Her devotion to her husband—her revelation of the inner life of a Chinese household, rarely open to a foreigner—her own vivid emotions as she lived the life of a Chinese daughter-in-law—make her story an outstanding human document.

Read the first instalment in the June

ASIA

The American MAGAZINE on the Orient
More than 60 illustrations—Art insert of 8 pages

A new Asiatic Continent is being born. All those fabled lands are struggling out of the mists of centuries. The cries of camel drivers are still heard, but across caravan routes and over mountain passes echo the sounds of locomotives, motor cars, airships. And yet the mystery of the East remains. Month by month this renaissance is recorded in ASIA, the only American magazine treating exclusively of the Orient, through authoritative articles, fiction and beautiful pictures.

CONTENTS OF THE JUNE "ASIA"

Long Shots from the Malekula Bush *By Martin Johnson*
Moments that make your blood run cold and your spine creep! Going after big game in the jungle has nothing on going into the heart of cannibal-land after big movies.

Java and A Story *By L. Adams Beck*
The Dutch have done their honest best to make Java over according to the Holland mould. But, Java belongs to the enchanted East and she stays there. L. Adams Beck has caught the beauty of this island country in the glittering net of his article.

Saving China *By J. O. P. Bland*
Again the big question of how far we should impose our civilization upon China in her adjustment to modern ideals! Mr. Bland, replying to Professor John Dewey, believes that neither American nor British institutions will "save" China, but that new Chinese ideals and manners and systems will be evolved by the Chinese themselves in accordance with the traditions of the race.

Up a Tree in The Jungle *By Charles Mayer*
After reading this final instalment of Mayer's sensational experiences in the jungle, you will be satisfied for all time to limit your acquaintance with seladangs to a quiet view of them *stuffed* in some museum.

Shoes of Asia *By Roland Gorbold*
Here's a man with a fascinating hobby! Shoes from every Asiatic land! Through this collection, from the rawhide sandal of a Jibbur herdsman to the tiny embroidered slipper of a Persian Princess, one can follow the development of races.

Taming the Yellow River *By Charles K. Edmunds*
John R. Freeman wants to make the Yellow River itself dig a new channel—fertilize the millions of acres it flows through—be a friend to the people of China, instead of the monster it is today bringing flood, famine, pestilence and death.

On the Famine Front in Shantung *By J. J. Heeren*
Read this short article by Mr. Heeren and you will see what China is doing, through Chinese and foreign organizations, not only to feed millions of famine sufferers but to prevent pestilence from following on the heels of famine.

Pilgrim-paths in the Lama Country *By Will Thompson*
Yellow clad pilgrims climbing up Dokerla, the holy mountain of Tibet; trees inscribed with prayers; the distant chanting of the Holy Laws; the bells of mountain Lamaseries calling the faithful to evening benediction!

SPECIAL OFFER

Five Months for One Dollar. Open to New Readers Only. ASIA is on sale at all news-stands at 35c per copy. This offer brings you the next five issues—$1.75 value—for $1.00, a saving of 75c.

Fill out the coupon and take a trip to Asia

ASIA PUBLISHING COMPANY,
627 Lexington Avenue, N. Y.

Send the next five issues of ASIA, the American Magazine on the Orient, beginning with the current number. I enclose $1.00. Nation 5-21-21

Name.....

Address.....

Business or Profession.....

Canadian $1.20. Foreign $1.40.

THE JOLLY NEW WORLD

"The interesting questions which are raised in regard to capital and labor, and its illuminating discussion of internationalism and pacifism, should be read by everyone who claims to be at all conversant with world problems."—(Bishop) PAUL JONES.

"An extraordinarily nice thing to give one's obdurate conservative friends."—MARY WARE DENNETT.

"The best presentation since Emerson's essay on The Conservative."—D. G. KITCHCOCK.

A 32-page pamphlet in lighter vein. Price 25 cts.

THE ARBITRATOR

P. O. Box 42, Wall St. Station, New York City

J. H. Thomas

When Labor Rules

"The General Secretary of the British National Railway Men's Union, and a leading member of Parliament is a conservative among radicals, and would be a leading member, perhaps Prime Minister, in a labor government in England.

"The author states his views as to how labor should govern Britain. He addresses himself to outsiders who are curious or disquieted. Describing with such wide scope the national policies to which his dominant section of the Labor Party is now committed his book is a valuable picture of the England which, it may be, lies just over the horizon."

—William L. Chenery in The Survey.

Just published—$2.00, *by mail*, $2.10

Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1 West 47th St., New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the choice of the wife extends to the children brought up by her.

In case of the death of both parents the choice is adjourned until the child attains the age of 18 years, and from that date are reckoned all time periods determined in the present Article. For others incapable of legal action the choice is made by a legal representative. . . .

[The remaining sections of Article VI deal with the manner of effecting this new optional system.]

ARTICLE VII

National Rights

(1) Russia and the Ukraine guarantee to persons of Polish nationality who are in Russia, the Ukraine, and White-Russia, on the principle of the equality of national rights, all rights securing the free development of culture, language, and the exercise of religious rites. Reciprocally, Poland guarantees to persons of Russian, Ukrainian, and White-Russian nationality who are in Poland, all these rights. . . .

ARTICLE VIII

Costs of the War

Both contracting parties reciprocally renounce the restitution of the costs of the war, that is, state expenditure for the carrying on of war between them, as well as indemnity for war losses, namely, for losses that were inflicted on them or their citizens on the territory of war operations by military activities and dispositions during the Polish-Russian-Ukrainian war.

ARTICLE IX

Repatriation

(1) The Agreement on repatriation concluded between Poland on the one hand and Russia and the Ukraine on the other hand in the execution of Article 7 of the Agreement on the preliminary conditions of peace of October 12, 1920, signed in Riga on February 24, 1921, remains in power. . . .

[Article IX also provides for payment of the cost of maintenance of prisoners of war, and permits the exhumation and exchange of the bodies of prisoners of war, soldiers, and officers of one country buried in another.]

ARTICLE X

Amnesty

(1) Each of the contracting parties guarantees tc the citizens of the other party complete amnesty for political crimes and offenses.

By political crimes and offenses is understood acts directed against the organization or the safety of the state, as well as acts committed to the advantage of the other party.

(2) The amnesty extends also to acts pursued by administrative procedure or outside the courts, as well as to infractions of prescriptions obligatory for war prisoners and interned persons, and in general citizens of the other party.

(3) The application of amnesty according to Points 1 and 2 of the present Article involves the obligation not to institute new investigations, the annulment of pursuits already instituted, and the non-execution of sentences already pronounced.

(4) The withholding of the execution of sentences does not necessarily involve the setting at liberty; in the latter case, however, the persons concerned should be immediately surrendered to the authorities of their own state, together with all the documents.

If, however, a person should declare that he does not wish to return to his country, or if the authorities of his country should not agree to receive him, this person may be again deprived of liberty.

(5) Persons who are under accusation or being prosecuted, against whom preliminary proceedings are being taken, or who are on trial for common offenses, and also those undergoing sentence for these offenses, will, at the demand of the state of which they are citizens, be surrendered immediately, together with all the documents.

(6) The amnesty foreseen in the present Article extends to all the above mentioned acts committed up to the moment of the ratification of the present treaty.

The execution of death sentences for the acts above mentioned will be withheld from the moment of the signing of the present Article.

ARTICLE XI

Monuments and Archives

[Russia and the Ukraine agree to restore to Poland all war trophies, libraries, collections of books, archaeological collections, archives, works of art, relics, as well as all kinds of collections and objects of historic, national, artistic, archaeological, scientific, or general cultural value which have been removed from Poland by Russia since January 1, 1772, the cost to be borne by the state making the restitution. A special Mixed Commission is to be formed to execute the provisions of Article XI.]

ARTICLE XII

State Property

Both contracting parties recognize that state property of every kind on the territory of the one or the other of the contracting states, or subject to reevacuation to that state on the basis of the present treaty, forms its indisputable property. By state property is understood every kind of property, and property rights, of the state itself, as well as of state institutions; property and property rights; of appanage, cabinets, palaces, all kinds of property and property rights of the former Russian Empire and members of the former imperial family, and all kinds of property and property rights, donated by former Russian emperors.

Both contracting parties renounce, reciprocally, all claims arising from the division of state property, in so far as the present treaty does not make a different decision. . . .

ARTICLE XIII

Gold

On the basis of the active participation of the territories of the Republic of Poland in the economic life of the former Russian Empire, recognized by the Agreement on the preliminary conditions of peace of the 12th of October, 1920, Russia and the Ukraine undertake the obligation to pay to Poland (30) thirty million gold rubles in coin or ingots, not later than within one year from the moment of the ratification of the present treaty.

ARTICLE XIV

The Reevacuation of State Property

[Article XIV deals with the division of all state railways and state river property.]

ARTICLE XV

Reevacuation of Private Property

(2) Both contracting parties undertake the obligation to reciprocally reevacuate, at the desire of the Government of the other party, based on the declaration of proprietors, the property of self-governing bodies, institutions, physical and legal persons, on the territory of the other party, voluntarily or forcibly evacuated after the 1st of October, 1915 [and from the beginning of the World War up to the 1st of October, 1915].

(8) All demands for the reevacuation of property should be made to the Mixed Commission within the period of one year from the day of the ratification of the present treaty; after the lapse of this period, no demand will be accepted by the state making the restitution.

ARTICLE XVI

Capital and Funds

[Article XVI provides that the property of religious and scientific organizations be dealt with in the same manner as private property.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6½% to 12½%

on

UTILITY BONDS

Inquiries Invited

A. W. H. MUNFORD

Investment Securities

61 BROADWAY NEW YORK

Telephone, Bowling Green 5657

THESE ARE HARVEST DAYS

FOR THE SMALL INVESTOR

The whole world is bidding for money at the highest interest rate in all history.

Today you can get $10 on every $100 with safety on a certain high-grade preferred stock with valuable "rights."

Write for Financial Statement, Bank References

J. E. THOMSON & CO., Inc.

130 LIBERTY STREET NEW YORK

An Analysis on

GENERAL ASPHALT

—discussing the market position of this company together with outline of reasons behind its activity.

Condensed Survey of the

OIL SITUATION

—covering every important phase of the industry and setting forth the financial and market position of the important companies.

Both subjects contained in Circular No. NA-3. Sent without obligation

M. S. WOLFE & CO.

ESTABLISHED 1906

41 BROAD ST., NEW YORK.

Phone: Broad 25

What Is Behind the Activity In the Coppers?

It is of particular interest just at this time to know just what copper companies are in the strongest physical position. That knowledge will serve as a basis for deciding which of the copper stocks are most attractive.

We have given considerable attention to the copper stocks recently and have prepared a special circular, copies of which will be sent gratis.

Ask for Circular NT-52.

Charles H. Clarkson & Co., Inc.

STOCKS–BONDS

66 Broadway, New York Tel. Rector 4663-4

What is the Real Outlook for the Copper Industry?

What is going to be done with the present big surplus of copper metal?

What is the prospect of an increasing demand for copper from Europe, and when is it likely to begin?

Is this the time to purchase good copper stocks?

These questions, together with a review of the entire copper situation, are covered in detail in a specially prepared circular we have for *free* distribution.

Ask for NN-56

E. M. FULLER & CO.

Members of Consolidated Stock Exchange of N. Y

50 BROAD STREET NEW YORK

Chicago Cleveland Pittsburgh Newark Boston

(*Direct Private Wires*)

Advocate of Peace

Monthly Official Organ American Peace Society

Founded 1828

Edited where national and international currents converge.

Favors a "law governed world, a peace through justice."

Furnishes news, texts of state papers, articles by specialists, and reasoned editorial opinions about the world that is and is to be.

ARTHUR DEERIN CALL, Editor
GEORGE PERRY MORRIS, Asst. Editor

Mail your subscription today $2.00

American Peace Society

612, 613, 614 Colorado Bldg.
Washington, D. C.

Bondholders!

Thousands of investors own bonds bought at high levels. Few grasp the full possibilities shrewd exchanges present.

We have prepared a special letter giving a plan whereby low-yielding bonds may be profitably exchanged into high-yielding issues. Also describing use of dormant purchasing power adopted by the keenest traders.

Write Dept. NO for "Bond Exchanges"

L. L. WINKELMAN & CO.

62 Broad Street New York

Telephone Broad 6470

Branch Offices in Leading Cities. *Direct Wires to Various Markets*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ARTICLE XVII

Legal Condition of Individual Citizens

(1) Russia and the Ukraine undertake the obligation to effect the settlement of accounts with Poland with reference to Polish investments, deposits, and securities of legal and physical persons, in Russian and Ukrainian state credit institutions, nationalized or liquidated, as well as in state institutions and treasuries. . . .

[The conditions of the settlement with Poland are added.]

ARTICLE XVIII

Account-Settlement Commission

[Article XVIII creates a Mixed Account-Settlement Commission for the carrying out of the conditions set forth in Article XVII.]

ARTICLE XIX

Russian Debts

Russia and the Ukraine liberate Poland from responsibility for debts and for all other kinds of obligation of the former Russian Empire, including obligations proceeding from the issue of paper money, treasury-bills, obligations, promissory notes, serial issues, Russian treasury bonds, and from guaranties accorded to all institutions and enterprises, as well as from the guaranty debts of the same, etc.

ARTICLE XX

Compensation

Russia and the Ukraine undertake the obligation to accord to Poland, her citizens, and legal persons, automatically, and without any special agreement, on the basis of the principle of the most favored nation, all the rights, privileges, and concessions accorded or to be accorded directly or indirectly by them to any other state, its citizens, and legal persons, in the domain of the restitution of property and compensation for losses during the period of the revolution and civil war in Russia and the Ukraine.

In the cases foreseen above, Russia and the Ukraine will recognize the binding power not only of original documents confirming the property rights of Polish physical and legal persons, but also those documents which will be issued by the Mixed Commission foreseen in Articles XV and XVIII of the present treaty.

ARTICLE XXI

Further Agreements

Both contracting parties undertake the obligation to begin, not later than within six weeks from the day of the ratification of the present treaty, negotiations on the question of a commercial agreement, and an agreement concerning the exchange of goods on the basis of compensation (i.e., barter); also to begin, as soon as possible, negotiations concerning the conclusion of a consular, post and telegraph, railway, sanitary and veterinary convention, as well as a convention concerning the improvement of navigation conditions on the Dnieper-Vistula and the Dnieper-Dzwina waterways.

ARTICLE XXII

Transit of Goods

(1) Up to the time of the conclusion of the commercial agreement and the railway convention, both contracting parties undertake the obligation to permit the transit of goods on the following conditions:

The principles of the present Article should form the basis of the future commercial agreement in the parts concerning transit.

(2) Both contracting parties accord to each other, reciprocally, the free transit of goods on all railways and waterways open to transit.

The transport of transit goods will take place with the observance of the prescriptions determined in each of the contracting states for traffic on railways and waterways, and take into consideration transport facilities and the needs of interior traffic.

(3) By free transit of goods both contracting parties understand that goods transported from Russia or the Ukraine, or to Russia or the Ukraine through Poland, as well as from Poland or to Poland through Russia or the Ukraine, will not be subject to any transit duties or any other payments arising from transit, whether these goods pass straight through the territory of one of the contracting parties or are unloaded on the way, stored for a time in warehouses, and reloaded for further transport, on condition that these operations are carried out in warehouses under the supervision of the customs authorities of the country through which the goods are passing.

(4) Poland reserves to herself liberty in the regulation of the conditions of transit for goods of German and Austrian origin, imported from Germany and Austria through Poland to Russia and the Ukraine.

The transit of arms, military equipment, and objects is prohibited.

The restriction does not extend to objects which, although military, are not intended for military purposes. For the transit of such objects, the declaration that they will not be used as military material will be demanded of the respective Governments. . . .

(5) Goods from other states in transit through the territory of one of the contracting parties while being imported to the territory of the other party, will not be subject to other or higher payments than those which might be levied on such goods coming straight from their country of origin.

(6) Freights, tariffs, and other payments for the transport of goods by transit, may not be higher than those which are levied for the transport of such goods in interior communication on the same line and in the same direction.

As long as freights, tariffs, and other payments are not levied for the interior transport of goods in Russia and the Ukraine, payments for the transport of goods by transit from Poland and to Poland through Russia and the Ukraine may not be higher than the payments determined for the transport of goods by transit through the most favored country.

ARTICLE XXIII

Territorial Clause

Russia and the Ukraine declare that all obligations undertaken by them towards Poland, as well as the rights they have acquired by the present treaty, apply to all the territories situated to the east of the state frontier defined in Article II of the present treaty, which territory formed part of the Russian Empire, and by the conclusion of the present treaty are represented by Russia and the Ukraine.

In particular, all the rights and obligations above denominated extend to White-Russia, respectively to its citizens.

ARTICLE XXIV

Diplomatic Relations

Diplomatic relations between the contracting parties will be inaugurated immediately after the ratification of the present treaty.

ARTICLE XXVI*

Ratification

The present treaty is subject to ratification, and will come into force from the moment of the exchange of the documents of ratification, in so far as the treaty or its annexes do not contain other dispositions. . . .

IN FAITH WHEREOF the plenipotentiaries of both contracting parties have signed m.p. the present treaty, and affixed thereto their seals.

Done and signed in Riga, the eighteenth day of March, one thousand nine hundred and twenty-one.

*Note. In all copies of the treaty received in the United States to date there was no Article XXV. Either the last article should have been numbered XXV or an article was omitted in the copies. If it is later learned that an article is omitted from this text, corrections will be made.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED